

SUPPLEMENTS TO
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE



The Development
of the Term
ἐνυπόστατος
from Origen to
John of Damascus



BENJAMIN GLEEDE

BRILL

The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος from Origen to John of Damascus

Supplements
to
Vigiliae Christianae

Texts and Studies of
Early Christian Life and Language

Editors

J. den Boeft – B.D. Ehrman – J. van Oort
D.T. Runia – C. Scholten – J.C.M. van Winden

VOLUME 113

The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος from Origen to John of Damascus

By

Benjamin Gleede



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2012

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gleede, Benjamin.

The development of the term [enupostatos] from Origen to John of Damascus / by Benjamin Gleede.

p. cm. – (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, ISSN 0920-623X ; v. 113)

On t.p. "enupostatos" appears in the Greek alphabet.

Revision of the author's thesis (MA)–Durham University, 2004.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-22419-3 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-22799-6 (e-book)

1. Hypostatic union–History of doctrines–Early church, ca. 30-600. 2. Jesus Christ–Natures–History of doctrines–Early church, ca. 30-600. I. Title.

BT213.G54 2012

232'.809015–dc23

2012001743

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.nl/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978 90 04 22419 3 (hardback)

ISBN 978 90 04 22799 6 (e-book)

Copyright 2012 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	IX
Abbreviations	XI
Introduction	1

PART I

THE PRE-NEOCHALCEDONIAN ΕΝΥΠΙΟΣΤΑΤΟΣ-TRADITION

1. The Origin of the Term	11
1.1. Basic Considerations	11
1.2. ένυπόστατος—A Genuinely Christian Theological Term	12
1.2.1. Irenaeus?	13
1.2.2. Origen	14
1.2.3. Origin and Genuine Meaning(s) of the Term	17
2. ένυπόστατος as a Technical Term of Trinitarian Theology	25
2.1. The Rise and Development of a Technical Usage during the Arian Controversy	25
2.1.1. A First Instance of Theological Relevance: The Letter of the Six Bishops	25
2.1.2. A ‘Third Kind’ of Logos: προφορικός, ένδιάθετος, ένυπόστατος	26
2.1.3. The Hypostatical Independence of the Logos in the Creeds	29
2.2. The Establishment of the Technical Usage in Late Fourth- and Early Fifth-Century Authors	33
2.2.1. Ps-Athanasius and Didymus	33
2.2.2. Epiphanius of Salamis	35
2.2.3. John Chrysostom	37
2.2.4. Cyril of Alexandria	38

PART II

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL APPLICATION OF ΕΝΥΠΟΣΤΑΤΟΣ

Introduction	45
3. ἐνυπόστατος, the ‘Insubsistence Formula’, Their Connection and Relevance for Post-Chalcedonian Christology during the Sixth-Century Debate	49
3.1. John the Grammarian and the Introduction of ἐνυπόστατος into the Christological Debate	50
3.1.1. ἐνυπόστατος and Insubsistence in John’s Apology for Chalcedon	50
3.1.2. Background and Possible Sources	56
3.2. Leontius of Byzantium and the Distinction between ἐνυπόστατον and ὑπόστασις	61
3.2.1. Interpreting the ‘Locus Classicus’	61
3.2.2. Leontius and the Insubsistence Formula	68
3.3. Philosophical Excursus: The Distinction καθ’ αὐτό—ἐν ἄλλῳ, the Problem of Substantial Qualities and Inexisting Natures	69
3.3.1. Origin and Problems of the Distinction	69
3.3.2. Attempted Solutions in the Later Commentaries on Aristotle	76
3.3.3. Inherence of Accidents	79
3.3.4. Inherence of Substantial Parts (Specific Differences, Substantial Qualities)	83
3.3.5. Inherence of Genera and Species	89
3.3.5.1. The Problem of Participation	91
3.3.5.2. The Problem of Individuation and Immattered Forms	96
3.4. Ephrem of Amid	100
3.5. Pamphilus the Theologian	104
3.5.1. Pamphilus Reading Leontius of Byzantium	105
3.5.2. Complementary Neochalcedonian Arguments: Pamphilus and the Insubsistence Formula	110
3.6. <i>De sectis</i> , Anastasius of Antioch and the Christological Disadvantages of the Common Usage	114
3.6.1. <i>De sectis</i> , Praxis VII	114

3.6.2. Anastasius I. of Antioch, the Disadvantages of the Common Usage and the Systematical Problems of Insubsistence-Christology	118
3.7. Leontius of Jerusalem.....	122
3.7.1. Leontius' Usage of ἐνυπόστατος	123
3.7.2. Leontius and the Insubsistence Formula	132
4. ἐνυπόστατος, the 'Insubsistence Formula', Their Connection and Relevance for the Culmination of Chalcedonian Christological Thought.....	139
4.1. Maximus the Confessor	139
4.1.1. Maximus' Usage of ἐνυπόστατος.....	141
4.1.2. The Insubsistence Formula in Maximus	150
4.2. Excursus: Anastasius Sinaites (and the Doctrina Patrum)	155
4.3. John of Damascus	162
4.3.1. ἐνυπόστατος in John of Damascus	163
4.3.1.1. The Trinitarian Usage.....	163
4.3.1.2. The Christological Usage	164
4.3.2. The Exact Meaning of the Insubsistence Formula	174
5. Summary	183
Bibliography	189
Index of Ancient Sources	201
General Index.....	208

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following study is a considerably refined version of my MA-thesis prepared under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Andrew Louth at Durham University in 2003/4. The inspiration to make a monograph out of it I owe, however, to my friend Christophe Erismann (Lausanne). The accomplishment of this task would have been impossible without the support and tolerance of my supervisor at Zurich, Prof. Dr. Silke Petra Bergjan. Of outstanding importance for the correction of language and the improvement of style in the paper was, moreover, the help of my friend Anna Latz (Tübingen).

Furthermore, I would like to thank my friends and colleagues whose company was absolutely indispensable for keeping up both motivation and inspiration during the ongoing work of research, especially Nestor Kavvadas, Alexander Schilling, Fazel Pakzad, Joan Almirall, Jana Matuszak, James Gardner, David Khunne, Janine and Hannes, Lulu Laverne, the cinemas of Nuremberg and Paris, the pubs of Nuremberg and Tuebingen and my dearest Kathrin R. Sahlmüller.

Last but not least, my special thanks go to the editorial board of the *Vigiliae Christianae* supplements-series for accepting my manuscript, the anonymous peer-reviewer for many valuable comments as to its improvement and the Brill publishing company for the effective handling of all the editorial technicalities.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ACO *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, ed. E. Schwartz/J. Straub/R. Schieffer, 5 vols, Berlin 1927–1984.
- CAG *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* (cf. Bibliography).
- CCG *Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca* (for used vols cf. Bibl.).
- CPG *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, ed. M. Geerard, 5 vols + 1 suppl, Turnhout 1:1983 2:1974 3:1979 4:1980 5:1987 suppl:1998.
- CSCO *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum orientalium* (for used vols cf. Bibl.).
- GCS *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* (for used vols cf. Bibl.).
- HWP *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, ed. J. Ritter e.a., 11 vols, Basel 1971–2001.
- MSG *Patrologiae cursus completus series graeca* (cf. Bibl.).
- MSL *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina*, hg. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols, Paris 1844 ff.
- PTS *Patristische Texte und Studien* (for used vols cf. Bibl.).
- RAC *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, 19 vols + 1 suppl, Stuttgart 1950 ff.
- RE *Paulys Realencyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*, ed. G. Wissowa e.a., Stuttgart 1893 ff.
- SC *Sources chrétiennes* (for used vols cf. Bibl.).
- TRE *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, ed. G. Krause / G. Müller, 34 vols, Berlin e.a. 1977 ff.

For the less frequently used abbreviations see *Theologische Realenzyklopädie. Abkürzungsverzeichnis*, ed. S. Schwertner, Berlin / New York ²1994.

INTRODUCTION

The so-called doctrine of ‘enhypostasia’ or ‘anhypostasia’ is probably the only thing an average theologian knows about the post-Chalcedonian development of patristic theology. This is by no means coincidental, as this doctrine supplies, as was already pointed out by K. Rozemond with regard to John of Damascus “la base terminologique de la christologie”¹ once the latter was to be developed within a Chalcedonian framework: two natures inseparably united in one hypostasis can only be conceived of if at least one of them does not have a hypostasis, i.e. independent existence of its own (“anhypostasia”), but subsists in the hypostasis of the former, i.e. the divine Logos (“enhypostasia”). In principle, this is the reading of Chalcedon canonized by the fifth council in 553, when the Justinian’s *Edict on the right faith* from two years before had made it absolutely clear that “according to the right reason we speak of the union of two natures and one hypostasis, as the Son of God—different from the Father in hypostasis, but identical with him in nature—created for himself a rationally and intellectually ensouled flesh, which makes clear that God the Logos was united to a human nature, not to the hypostasis or person of a certain individual. [...] For the human nature of Christ is never spoken of simply by itself, yet did not even have a hypostasis or person of its own, but took the beginning of its existence in the hypostasis of the Logos”.² The conviction that Christ does not have human hypostasis

¹ *La Christologie de St. Jean Damascène*, Ettal 1959, 22.

² *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, ed. M. Amelotti e.a., Milan ²1973, 144,29–33.146, 10–12 (διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον δύο φύσεων ἔνωσιν λέγομεν καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν, ἐπειδὴ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἕτερος ὢν παρὰ τὸν πατέρα, τῆς αὐτῆς δὲ φύσεως ὢν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει ἐδημιούργησεν ἑαυτῷ σάρκα ἐψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ καὶ νοεραῖ, ὅπερ δηλοῖ ἀνθρωπίνη φύσει ἐνωθῆναι τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον καὶ οὐχ ὑποστάσει ἥτοι προσώπῳ τοῦδε τινος. [...] οὕτε γὰρ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπλῶς ποτε λέγεται, ἀλλ’ οὕτε ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν ἥτοι πρόσωπον ἔσχεν, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει τοῦ λόγου τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἔλαβεν). Cf. already right at the beginning, *ibid.*, 132,24–27 (ἡ δὲ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἔνωσις δηλοῖ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς λόγος, τοῦτέστιν ἡ μία ὑπόστασις ἐκ τῶν τριῶν τῆς θεότητος ὑποστάσεων, οὐ προϋποστάντι ἀνθρώπῳ ἠνώθη, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου ἐδημιούργησεν ἑαυτῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει σάρκα ἐψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ καὶ νοεραῖ, ὅπερ ἐστὶ φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη). This conception of “union according to the hypostasis” clearly lies behind the 5th–8th canon of the Council (*Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum*

or “persona” thus became common sense not only amongst medieval and early modern theologians, but was—after having been dismissed by most Enlightenment- and 19th century theologians as denying to the saviour the most essential of all human traits: personality—still advocated in the twentieth century, and this by no less a theologian than Karl Barth himself. In the first part of his *Church dogmatics*, he writes:

In recent times the doctrine of anhypostasis and enhypostasis of Christ's human nature has occasionally been combated by the primitive argument, that if the human nature of Christ is without personality of its own, it is all up with the true humanity of Christ and the Docetism of early Christology holds the field. [...] But what Christ's human nature lacks according to the early doctrine is not what we call personality. This the early writers called individualitas, and they never taught that Christ's human nature lacked this [...]. Personalitas was their name for what we call existence or being. Their negative position asserted that Christ's flesh in itself had no existence, and this was asserted in the interest of their positive position that Christ's flesh has its existence through the Word and in the Word, who is God Himself acting as Revealer and Reconciler. Understood in this its original sense, this particular doctrine, abstruse in appearance only, is particularly well adapted to make it clear that the reality attested by Holy Scripture, Jesus Christ, is the reality of a divine act of Lordship which is unique and singular as compared with all other events, and in this way to characterize it as a reality held up to faith by revelation. It is in virtue of the eternal word that Jesus exists as a man of flesh and blood in our sphere, as a man like us, as a historical phenomenon. But it is only in virtue of the divine Word that He exists as such.³

In the fourth part, he continues this eulogy in calling the “enhypostasis or anhypostasis” of Christ's human nature “the sum and root of all the grace addressed to Him”,⁴ as “the fact that in Jesus Christ we do not have to do with a man into whom God has changed Himself, but unchanged and directly with God himself” entirely depends upon this conception, just like “the unity in which as man He is the Son of God and as the Son of God man; and finally [...] the universal relevance and significance of His existence for all other men”.⁵

et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum, ed. H. Denzinger/A. Schönmetzer, Freiburg 36th ed. 1976, 426–430), although those condemnations avoid its explicit positive statement.

³ *Church Dogmatics*, tr. G.W. Bromiley/T.F. Torrance, Vol. I/2, London/New York 2004, 164f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV/2, 91.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV/2, 49.

The following monograph is by no means daring enough to tackle all the grave systematical problems involved in statements like these,⁶ but its scope is limited to a merely philological problem concerning the labelling of this doctrine: The terms ἀνυποστασία or ἐνυποστασία do not exist in ancient Greek at all⁷ and are thus obviously not employed by post-Chalcedonian theologians to describe the doctrine in question either. In fact, the crucial terms discussed in the post-Chalcedonian debate are the corresponding adjectives ἐνυπόστατος and ἀνυπόστατος, as the Chalcedonian teaching of two natures in one hypostasis was dismissed by both Nestorian and Monophysite theologians on the grounds that in this case one of the natures would have to be ἀνυπόστατος, i.e. inexistent.⁸ The respective nouns, however, were coined during the reception of the Chalcedonian counter-arguments, almost exclusively via John's of Damascus *Source of knowledge*, within the confessional orthodoxy of the late sixteenth and seventeenth century, which on the basis of the philological and editorial work done by the Humanists started to read Patristic sources in their Greek original again. Of capital importance for the (re-)introduction of our term into the Christological debate seems to have been Marcus Hopperus' John of Damascus-edition from 1575, which for the first time presented in Greek not only the *Expositio fidei* (first printed in Greek in Verona 1531), but also the longer recension of the *Dialectics*.⁹ Hence, at first just the adjectives ἀνυπόστατος and ἐνυπόστατος reentered the discussions of the Christological conceptual framework,¹⁰ and it took a view decades before their usage became so customary that they could be transformed into nouns as well. Surprisingly enough, the negative noun ἀνυποστασία was of much more prominence in those theologians than any possible positive counterpart. The earliest reference for it I could find occurs in Balthasar Meisner's 50 Christological discussions from 1624.¹¹ There he seems to have initiated the dogmatical tradition

⁶ For a considerate criticism of Barth's interpretation cf. W. Pannenberg, *Grundzüge der Christologie*, Gütersloh 5th ed. 1976, 353f.

⁷ The occurrence of the former term in Hesychius' *Lexicon* (ed. K. Latte, Vol. 1, Copenhagen 1953, s.v. ἀτλησία) is not really an exception, as the term both may well have been coined by the lexicographer here and obviously has a different meaning.

⁸ Cf. bel. n. 144.

⁹ Cf. B. Kotter, *Die Überlieferung der Pege gnoseos des Hl. Johannes v. Damaskos*, Ettal 1959, 227.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. M. Chemnitz, *De duabus naturis in Christo* cap. 1, Jena 1591, 2f.

¹¹ The discussion of ἀνυποστασία as a mean term between non-existence and existence to be found in Johann Gerhard's *Loci theologici* (Locus IV cap. VII §112; ed. J.F. Cotta, Vol. 3, Tübingen 1764, 420f.), which was also incorporated in H. Schmid, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, Gütersloh 7th ed. 1893,

of appealing to the ἀνυποστασία of Christ's human nature as one of the latter's most important individuating features,¹² next to its sinnlessness and its singular excellence—a tradition that was handed down via Johann Andreas Quenstedt († 1688)¹³ to David Hollaz († 1713), the last important dogmatician of Lutheran orthodoxy.¹⁴ The corresponding positive term ἐνυπόστασις also exists, but seems to have been barely in use. In the fifth chapter of the second book of his *Christiana et catholica fides* from 1618 Matthias Martini apologizes for making use of it and thus probably signalizes that he is introducing here a neologism of his own:

This was given to Christ's flesh by the grace of the union that this flesh had in the hypostasis of the Son of God, *so to speak*, an ἐνυπόστασις, i.e. not that it subsisted by itself but that it ἐνυπάρχει, insubstituted in the aforesaid hypostasis in that the Logos carried it, but did not bestow it with being a hypostasis but rather ἐνυπόστατος, i.e. established in this person.¹⁵

217, does not appear in the original edition from 1610, but only in the second, fundamentally revised one from 1657.

¹² Cf. esp. disp. II th. 29f. (*Christologiae sacrae disputationes* L, Wittenberg 1624, 24f.): "XXVIII. Attributa vero carnis assumptae propria seu individuantia, quibus ab aliis hominibus distinguitur vicissim sunt vel totius vel partium. Totius sunt vel transitoria vel perpetua. Inter illa praecipua sunt conceptio ex Spiritu S. Luc. 1, 35. nativitas ex virgine. Luc. 2, 7. descensus ad inferos, Ephes. 4, 9. descensus in caelum Marc. 16, 19. reditus ad iudicium, Act. 1, 11. Ioh. 5, 27. XXIX. Totius perpetua sunt ἀνυποστασία (quia caro assumpta non subsistit per peculiarem ὑπόστασιν), subsistentia in λόγῳ, immunitas à peccato, communicatio idiomatum, sessio ad dexteram Patris." Cf. also *Disp.* V th. 13–19 (ibid., 64–66), where ἀνυποστασία is mentioned next to singularitas or individualitas as the two distinctive features of the assumed human nature.

¹³ *Theologia didactico-polemica* p. III c. 3 memb. 1 (vol. 3, Wittenberg 1691, 77): "Proprietas individualis naturae humanae est ἀνυποστασία sive carentia propriae subsistentiae. Non enim persona, (alioquin duae essent in Christo personae) sed natura humana propria personalitate destituta assumpta est, haec ipsa vero ἀνυποστασία propria longe eminentiori, imo infinita ὑποστάσει est compensata."

¹⁴ *Examen theologicum acroamaticum*, ed. R. Tellerus, Stockholm/Leipzig 1750, 658f. Those passages are translated and briefly discussed in M. Gockel, "A dubious Christological formula? Leontius of Byzantium and the *anhypostatos-enhypostatos* theory", in: *JThS* 51 (2000), (514–532) 528f.

¹⁵ *Christiana et catholica fides*, Bremen 1618, 271: "Num vero subsistentia seu personalitas aeterna Filii Dei communicata est carni? Subsistentia seu personalitas Filii Dei est modus ille aeternus, per quem Filius est secunda Deitatis persona, distincta a Patre & Spiritu sancto. Si haec proprie loquendo communicaretur carni, caro fieret ipsa illa aeterna secunda persona Deitatis. At id unioni huic est contrarium, quae facta est salvis naturis & naturarum proprietatibus atque actionibus. Hoc autem datum est carni Christi per unionis gratiam, ut illa caro in hypostasi Filii Dei habeat, ut sic dicamus, ἐνυπόστασιν, h. e. non ut subsistat ipsa sed ἐνυπάρχει, i. e. insubsistat in illa, gestante eam λόγῳ: non autem dante ei, ut sit hypostasis sed ἐνυπόστατος, h. e. personae illae insita." This text is resumed almost literally by A. Heidianus, *Corpus theologiae christianae*, Leiden 1686, 534.

This ‘translation’ of ἐνυπόστατος as “personae illae insita” is, however, in the patristic context, as will be shown below, quite problematic, yet clearly not as problematic as the more common version of the doctrine making the ἀνυποστασία or “lack of proper subsistence” one of the most distinctive features of Christ’s human nature. The primal concern of a Patristic Chalcedonian theologian would rather be a diametrically opposed one, i.e. to defend his creed by all means against the absurd consequence of Christ’s human nature being ἀνυπόστατος, i.e. inexistent. He would rather argue for the latter’s being ἐνυπόστατος, yet first of all in the sense of “existent” or “real”, not in the sense of “inexistent” or “lacking a proper hypostasis”. The two natures have to be there in the one hypostasis, no matter how! Thus, the question arises whether the labelling of the aforementioned inexistence- or insubsistence-conception as “enhypostasia” might be due to a much later intermingling of two different theological problems, i.e. (a) whether and to what extent the two natures in the one hypostasis can be said to exist or be ἐνυπόστατοι at all, and (b) how this is possible with respect to the two different natures, one instantiated in the Logos from all eternity, the other caused to subsist in him in the incarnation. This suspicion seems to be confirmed by the fact that the theologian who gave the term ἐνυπόστατος its prominence within the post-Chalcedonian discussion, Leontius of Byzantium, did not really endorse the Neochalcedonian insubsistence-concept canonized later on by Justinian, but rather displayed a strict reserve towards it.¹⁶ Hence, it is not all too astonishing that in a widely discussed, but still unpublished paper the Leontius-specialist Brian E. Daley proposed a wholesale denial of any connection between the term ἐνυπόστατος and the Neochalcedonian insubsistence-conception. The term in question, Daley argued, does not signify a quasi-accidental inherence of Christ’s human nature in the person of the divine Logos, but simply its reality. The prefix ἐν- is not to be misunderstood as meaning ‘in’, but—being the opposite of an α-privativum—has to be understood as ‘having’ or ‘endowed with’.¹⁷ Obviously, this gives rise to the question whether several hundred years of doctrinal tradition have in fact been misled by an insufficient acquaintance with Greek prefixes. Remarkably enough, neither the phrase ἐνυπόστατος τῷ λόγῳ used by seventeenth century dogmaticians¹⁸ nor equivalent constructions of the term with

¹⁶ Cf. bel. nn. 195 f.

¹⁷ Cf. the more detailed presentation of the scholarly discussion bel. at the beginning of part II.

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. H. Alsted, *Theologia scholastica*, Hannover 1618, 754 (according to H. Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, Elberfeld

a dative denoting the second trinitarian hypostasis ever occur in Patristic literature,¹⁹ which makes its possible interpretation as “insubsistent” again highly questionable.

The following examination wants to contribute to a solution of this problem on a mainly terminological level, i.e. by sketching the development of the usage and significance of the term ἐνυπόστατος from the very first references in the third century up to its highly elaborate and differentiated use in John of Damascus. The debate of its significance in the Christological controversies especially of the sixth and seventh century will thus be shown to suffer from a fundamental lack of differentiation even between two technical-theological usages of our term, an older trinitarian one, the origin and development of which will be the main subject of the first part of this study, and a later Christological one, which specifically originates in the famous passage from Leontius of Byzantium distinguishing between the hypostasis and the ἐνυπόστατον.

Thus we will proceed with advancing first of all a few suggestions about the origin of our term, its possible instances in second and third century literature and its wider range of meanings, which in some authors and periods also extends beyond the specifically theological realm.

1861, 304). Accordingly, F. Junius translates ἐνυπόστατος as “inexistens”, yet distinguishes it—as referring to the inexistent substantial part—form the “inhaerens accidens” (*Defensio catholicae doctrinae de s. trinitate*, Geneva 1613, 37 f.).

¹⁹ On the possibility of such a construction in general cf. bel. nn. 683f. The only possible reference for it to be found in the TLG is contained in the fourth Greek version of the *Symbolum Quicumque*, where especially the second article is rather a paraphrase introducing the entirety of postchalcendonian Christological technicalities into the creed. There we can read (MSG 28, 1589D–1592A): Καὶ τέλειος Θεὸς ὢν, γέγονε τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, μὴ τραπεῖς, μὴ ἀλλοιωθεὶς τὴν ὑπερούσιον καὶ ἄφραστον οὐσίαν τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος, ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης σαρκὸς οὐσιωθεὶς· αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ σὺν τῷ συμφύει αὐτοῦ παναγίῳ Πνεύματι δημιουργήσας τὴν παναγίαν τῆς σαρκὸς πρόσληψιν, τελείαν οὐσίαν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνυπόστατον αὐτῷ καὶ ἀδιαίρετον ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀμαρτίας ἀμέθεκτον· ἐκ τῶν παρθενικῶν ἀγνῶν αἱμάτων τῆς Θεομήτορος συμπαγέντος τοῦ σώματος, χωρὶς τινος θελήματος ἢ ἐννοήματος σαρκικοῦ· τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς αὐλῶς κτισθείσης, νοεράς, λογικῆς, θελητικῆς, ἐνεργητικῆς, ὅλης τεθεαμένης σὺν τῇ σαρκί, ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐκ πρώτης ὑπάρξεως, διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ἄκραν ἔνωσιν, ἀσύγχυτον καθ’ ὑπόστασιν. As the Greek versions of this creed, however, do not date back beyond the 12th century (cf. V. Laurent, “Le Symbole Quicumque et l’Église byzantine”, in: *Échos d’Orient* 35 [1936], 385–404) and this version is “in all probability of later date” than the other versions (G.D.W. Ommanney, *A critical dissertation on the Athanasian creed. Its original language, date, authorship, title, text, reception, and use*, Oxford 1897, 294) this text may well have inspired the Western theologians of the seventeenth century (according to *ibid.*, 293 it was first printed in an appendix to Ussher’s *De Romanae Ecclesiae symbolo Apostolico* in 1647), but clearly lies beyond the time frame of the present study.

Afterwards, we will provide a more detailed examination of the rise of the technical trinitarian usage within the Arian controversy, most probably promoted by Origenist circles, and its development up to Cyril of Alexandria. The quite surprising result will be that the technical trinitarian application of our term clearly shows the tendency opposite to the Christological one, as it is used to stress the hypostatical independence of the Logos, whereas in the context of Chalcedonian Christology it is exactly this which has to be denied to Christ's natures, first of all the human one.

The main part of our investigation will, however, focus on the technical Christological usage in the post-Chalcedonian debates and its connection with the Neochalcedonian insubistence-conception in examining the works most relevant for our problem one by one. The chapter on the sixth century will obviously focus on the famous text from Leontius' of Byzantium *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, which, as its first extant reader Pamphilus shows only a view decades later, apparently became something like an instant classic. Reading this text in the context of both the contemporary theological and philosophical debates about the ontological status of universal natures, substantial qualities, accidents and immattered forms insubstisting in individuals or hypostases will help to get a grasp on at least a few of the basic systematical problems to be faced in spelling out the trinitarian and Christological dogma within a Chalcedonian framework. How such a spelling out was finally accomplished in the seventh and eighth century, mainly by Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus, will be the main subject of the following chapter, in which our basic philological problems (usage and meaning of term ἐνυπόστατος, the insubistence formula and the connection of the two) will have to be dealt with in a slightly broader systematical horizon.

Finally, we will return the question of how to translate ἐνυπόστατος and take another look at the range of its possible meanings.

PART I

THE PRE-NEOCHALCEDONIAN ENYPIOΣΤΑΤΟΣ-TRADITION

CHAPTER ONE

THE ORIGIN OF THE TERM

1.1. BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

The Greek prefix ἐν- is subject to a crucial ambiguity which was not only puzzling for interpreters of sixth-century Christology. Being derived from the local preposition “in”, it can actually retain its literal, localising sense, e.g. in ἐγγάστριος (“in the womb”) or ἔνυγρος (“in the water”). Even Aristotle has to refute the possible misunderstanding of differentiae like (ζῶον) ἔνυδρον as distinguishing species of animals according to their location (Topics VI,6 144b31–145a1). However, it seems to have been employed metaphorically very early and is used from Homer onwards primarily in a possessive sense, i.e. denying an α-privativum, as in ἄτιμος-ἐντιμος. E. Schwyzer, however, mentions as meanings of the prefix besides possession also approximation, as in ἐνερεύθης (“*somewhat* red”) or ἐμπευκής (“*bitterish*”), or emphasis, as in ἐνδηλος (“very clear, manifest”).²⁰ Yet, he also demonstrates the polyvalence of the prefix, especially in cases like ἔνυδρος, which means “(living) in the water”, when applied e.g. to animals, “rich of water”, when applied to countries, “containing water”, when applied to vessels, or even “consisting of water”, when applied to streams or springs.²¹ What kind of relation between the subject and the term contained in the predicated adjective the prefix describes, has thus to be determined entirely on the basis of the respective context. In the context of a materialistic philosophy, ἐνυλος would in any case just mean ‘material’, i.e. it would describe a kind of identity between ὕλη and the ἔνυλον. In contrast, an idealistic philosophy would not conceive of the ἔνυλον as matter or material, but as in-mattered, i.e. currently in some kind of connection with matter without being identical with it. Similar examples are the important Christian terms ἔνσαρκος and ἐνσώματος. Melito of Sardes was blamed for being a materialist because of writing a treatise Περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ, which was interpreted as ‘On the corporeal God’,

²⁰ *Griechische Grammatik*, Vol. 2: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, München 1950, 456 f.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 456.

but probably in fact just meant ‘On the incorporated i.e. incarnate God’.²² We will have to see which of those possible meanings can be verified with regard to ἐνυπόστατος.

1.2. ΕΝΥΠΟΣΤΑΤΟΣ—A GENUINELY CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL TERM

It is a very astonishing fact that the term ἐνυπόστατος—at least until the sixth century CE—seems to appear only in Christian texts. The only possible pagan reference provided by the TLG comes from Secundus, a gnomologist of the second century, but in the light of a closer philological examination the instance appears to originate in a later misreading of ἐνυπόστατος for ἀνυπόστατος.

According to the manuscripts B (XI), Pc (XIII) and V (XIII), the question of what constitutes a friend is answered by ἐνυπόστατον κειμήλιον.²³ However, Perry’s decision to accept this reading is very problematic in my opinion, as he took the immediate context of the phrase from PNA, a family he regards as derived from the same source (“excerpt b”) as B, Pc and V.²⁴ In PNA the text reads: Τί φίλος; [...] ἀγκών ταλαιπορίας, κατὰσκοπος βίου, ἀνθρωπος ἀκατάληπτος, ἀνυπόστατον κειμήλιον, ἀκατάληπτος εὐτυχία. BPcV replace

²² Cf. A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. 1, Freiburg 1979, 210f. Cf. also Maximus Confessor, Ambiguum 17 (MSG 91, 1225C). Although “material” is not mentioned as a possible meaning of ἔνυλος in H.G. Liddell / R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon. A New Edition revised and augmented throughout by H.S. Jones*, Oxford 1958, s.v. (col. 579a), the frequent opposition of the word to ἄνυλος is much more easily explained by presupposing this ‘simpler’ meaning rather than the more complicated “involved or implicated in matter” (Cf. e.g. Eusebius, *Demonstratio evangelica* III,3,10; ed. I.A. Heikel, Leipzig 1913 [GCS 23], 111 [quoting Porphyry] / Denys the Areopagite, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* I,5; ed. G. Heil/A.M. Ritter, Berlin 1991 [PTS 36], 67,21–23 / Hermeias, *In Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, ed. P. Couvreur, Paris 1901 [repr. Hildesheim 1971], 65,5–7 and similarly Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* I,6,45,1; ed. O. Stählin, Leipzig 1905 [GCS 12], 117 / Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam* [MSG 70, 680B] / Proclus, *The Elements of Theology*, prop. 209; ed. E.R. Dodds, Oxford 1963, 182f.). However, in philosophical texts, the hylomorphic metaphysics most of them are based on makes a decision very difficult, since every ‘material’ object is constituted by a form ‘impressed’ in the formless prime matter. Anyway, in case of the πάντως ἔνυλα (Olympiodorus, *Prolegmena*; CAG XII/1, 9,36f.), the objects of natural science, ‘being involved in matter’ ultimately amounts to being material.

²³ B.E. Perry, *Secundus the silent philosopher*, Ithaca/New York 1964, 84 (Sent. 11). The next pagan reference comes from the early sixth century philosopher Asclepius, pupil of Ammonius Hermείου (*In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 363,21). However, as the term is also used by his Christian colleague John Philoponus (CAG XVI, 4,20; 205,19), but never by his pagan colleagues Simplicius and Olympiodorus (or the Athenian Platonists Proclus and Damascius), this might also be an echo of a Christian upbringing.

²⁴ Cf. Perry’s introduction in *Secundus*, 14–23 (stemma on 22).

ἄνθρωπος ἀκατάληπτος by δυσκατάληπτον εὔρημα and ἀκατάληπτος εὐτυχία by ἄπρονος ἐπιτυχία (B), ἐπίμονος εὐτυχία (Pc), or ἀπόμονος ἐπιτυχία (V) respectively. Hence, all three manuscripts show the tendency to suppress Secundus' pessimism with regard to the possibility of finding or retaining friends, which would be completely in line with a replacement of ἀνυπόστατον by ἐνυπόστατον. Moreover, the obvious misreading ἀνυπόστατον κειμήλιον in R—the oldest manuscript²⁵—is much more easily explained by assuming ἀνυπόστατον in its original. Probably, just like Perry, the scribe may have thought that it does not make much sense to call a friend a “non-existent treasure”. However, put aside the two ἀκατάληπτος-phrases, ἀνυπόστατον κειμήλιον is in my opinion a very suitable expression for the incomparable preciousness of a friend which cannot be grasped or easily attained like a concrete, material hypostasis.

1.2.1. *Irenaeus?*

As to the Christian references, the term apparently did not become fashionable before the middle of the fourth century. The only second century author to whom a use of the term is attributed is Irenaeus, to whom the following fragment is ascribed:

Take a look at Joshua, the son of Nun. For Moses had to bring God's people out of Egypt, Joshua had to lead them into the given heritage. Moses, as the law, had to come to an end, Joshua, as the word and the unadulterated simile of the true Word (τοῦ ἐνυποστάτου Λόγου τύπος ἀψεudής), had to preach to the people. Moses had to give the fathers Manna as nourishment, Joshua, however, wheat, the first-fruit of life already, the type of Christ's body, just as Scripture says that the Lord's Manna ceased to be at that point, after the people had started eating wheat from the soil.²⁶

As Irenaeus could, however, hardly assume his readers to be familiar enough with the term ἐνυπόστατος Λόγος (which remains quite rare for another 120 years after Irenaeus) to understand this text, scholars were probably right in regarding the fragment as spurious exactly because of this term.²⁷ In addition to that, the content of the text can in my opinion be supposed

²⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 10 f.

²⁶ *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses*, ed. W.W. Harvey, vol. 2, Cambridge 1857, 488: Λαβὲ πρὸς σεαυτὸν τὸν Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυῆ. Ἔδει γὰρ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου Μωϋσῆν τὸν λαὸν ἐξαγαγεῖν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὴν κληροδοσίαν εἰσαγαγεῖν· καὶ τὸν μὲν Μωϋσῆν ὡς νόμον ἀνάπαυλαν λαμβάνειν, Ἰησοῦν δὲ ὡς λόγον, καὶ τοῦ ἐνυποστάτου Λόγου τύπον ἀψεudῆ, τῷ λαῷ δημηγορεῖν καὶ τὸν μὲν Μωϋσῆν τὸ μάννα τοῖς πατράσι τροφὴν διδόναι, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν τὸν σίτον, ἄρτι τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῆς ζωῆς, τύπον τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καθά φησι καὶ ἡ γραφή, ὅτι τότε ἐπαύσατο τὸ μάννα Κυρίου, μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν τὸν σίτον λαὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

²⁷ Cf. R.M. Grant, “The Fragments of the Greek Apologists and Irenaeus”, in: *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of R.P. Casey*, Freiburg 1963, 213: “The difficult word in the fragment is ‘hypostatic’ (ἐνυποστάτου); this cannot come from Irenaeus.”

to depend most likely on Origen's exegesis of 1 Cor 10:1–6, as presented for example in his *Commentary on John* VI, 44f. Just as the Irenaeus-fragment, Origen advances here two analogies between Joshua and Jesus Christ which are rather unusual in similar exegetical contexts:²⁸ Firstly, the succession of Joshua to Moses is claimed to foreshadow the one of law and gospel,²⁹ and secondly and more importantly, Moses' divine Manna is judged to be inferior to the bread from Israel's soil with reference to Jos 5:11f., a point which is only hinted at in the fragment,³⁰ but developed with further exegetical justifications in Origen.³¹

1.2.2. Origen

In the third century, we only find the term in three fragments attributed to Origen, one of them clearly spurious,³² and in the correspondence with Paul of Samosata dismissed as a wholesale forgery, e.g. by Eduard Schwartz.

²⁸ Cf. the references in G.W. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961, s.v. 'Ἰησοῦς A 2/B (672).

²⁹ Cf. Frg. 19,1–5 ('Ἐδει γὰρ [...] τὸν μὲν Μωϋσῆν ὡς νόμον ἀνάπαυλαν λαμβάνειν, Ἰησοῦν δὲ ὡς λόγον, καὶ τοῦ ἐνυποστάτου Λόγου τύπον ἀψευδῆ, τῷ λαῷ δημηγορεῖν) and Origen, *Commentary on John* VI, 44,229 (ed. C. Blanc, Paris 1970 [SC 157], 302): Τύπος δὲ ὁ διαδεξάμενος ἦν Μωσὴν Ἰησοῦς τοῦ διαδεξαμένου τὴν διὰ τοῦ νόμου οἰκονομίαν τῷ εὐαγγελικῷ κηρύγματι Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

³⁰ Frg. 19,5–10.

³¹ *Commentary on John* VI, 45,234–237 (SC 157, 306–308).

³² I.e. the last fragment of the *Scholia in Matthaum*. Cf. *Origenes Matthäuserklärung III. Fragmente und Indices*, ed. E. Benz / E. Klostermann, Leipzig 1941 (GCS 41), 235. The phrase ἐνυπόστατος γέννησις will most conveniently be interpreted as "generation resulting in a hypostasis", as is made clear by a parallel from the *Catenae* (ed. J.A. Cramer, vol. 3, Oxford 1838 [repr. Hildesheim 1967], 42,25–27: ἐκλαμβανέντω ἐν Υἱῷ τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν ἐνυποστάτῳ γεννήσει, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐνυποστάτῳ οὐσιώδει ὑπάρξει.) and from a passage in Rufinus' *Expositio Symboli* 7 (ed. M. Simonetti, Turnhout 1961 [CCL 20], 143f.), where he clarifies the light-shine and might-thought simile for the trinitarian generation in that the latter cannot be an "insubstantiva generatio", because the eternal substance of the divine light does not have anything "insubstantivum" in it (quoted bel. n. 107). Against the suggestion of Henrici quoted in the apparatus, I would, however, not assume a "Verfasser nach Art des Severus". The antimodalist rejection of a συναλοιφή of the three persons rather points to the second half of the fourth century, somewhere between or after Cyril of Jerusalem and Epiphanius. The former connects a similar warning in *Catecheses* IV,8; ed. W.C. Reischl / J. Rupp, vol. 1, Munich 1848, 98 with the Sabellian υἱοπάτωρ, saying: Καὶ μήτε ἀπαλλοτριώσης τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν, μήτε συναλοιφὴν ἐργασάμενος υἱοπατορίαν πιστεύσης, ἀλλὰ πιστεῦε ὅτι ἐνὸς Θεοῦ μονογενῆς εἰς ἐστὶν υἱός, ὁ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων Θεός Λόγος. Λόγος, οὐ προφορικὸς εἰς ἄερα διαχεόμενος, οὔτε λόγους ἀνυποστάτοις ἐξομοιούμενος· ἀλλὰ Λόγος υἱὸς λογικῶν ποιητής, Λόγος ἀκούων τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ λαλῶν αὐτός. Καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων κατὰ καιρὸν, εἰ ὁ Θεὸς παράσχοι, πλατύτερον ἡμῖν ῥηθήσεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιλανθανόμεθα τῆς προτάσεως, ὅτι κεφαλαιώδεις εἰσαγωγὰς πίστεως νῦν ποιοῦμεθα. (Cf. Cat. XI,16.18; ed. Reischl / Rupp, vol. 1, 310.312) In opposing the errors of Arius and Sabellius (οὔτε χωρίζομεν τὴν ἀγίαν τριάδα ὡς τινες, οὔτε

Nevertheless, at least in the case of Origen there are, in my opinion, sufficient grounds to suppose that he actually did use the term, maybe even coined it himself, as its widespread use in theological texts from the second half of the fourth century definitely points, as will be shown, to an Origenist provenance. The two remaining catena fragments of yet, as far as I see, unquestioned authenticity employ the term in two different ways, one strongly reminiscent of the later technical usage, the other non-technically, doxologically. This second instance comes from a catena on *Deuteronomy* 16:20, where a letter of Origen's to the elders Photius and Andrew is quoted. This letter expounds Moses' sermon on righteousness and en passant denies to the Old Testament prophet the title of a true ἐκκλησιαστής, as "the true preacher, the head of the Church and the highest and ἐνυπόστατος wisdom and word" can be nobody but Christ himself.³³ As this phrase is presented by the catena within a very short excerpt, one can hardly assign any internal reasons for doubting the authenticity of this letter. However, such doubts could be raised concerning the other catena fragment on Proverbs, as it anticipates the later technical usage to a considerable extent. The passage presents a differentiation between two kinds of wisdom, the one given to the believers by the Spirit and the ἐνυπόστατος Υἱὸς καὶ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, who brought everything into being by his wisdom,³⁴ i.e. non-substantial wisdom

συναλοιφήν ὡς Σαβέλλιος ἐργαζόμεθα. Cat. XVI,4; ed. Reischl/Rupp, vol. 2, Munich 1860, 208) Epiphanius might be dependent on him (e.g. *Panarion* 62,3,4; ed. K. Holl, vol. II, Leipzig 1922 [GCS 31], 393/62,7,1; *ibid.*, 395 a.m.). Already Eusebius in his *De ecclesiastica theologia* III, 15,3 (*Eusebius Werke*, Vol. 4: *Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcells*, ed. E. Klostermann/G.C. Hansen, Berlin 1972 [GCS 14], 172) defends a subordinatist conception of the ὑποταγή τοῦ υἱοῦ against a συναλοιφή τις καὶ σύγχυσις τῶν ὄλων.

³³ MSG 17, 28B (on Dtn 16:20: Δικαίως τὸ δίκαιον διώξεις): Τουτέστιν, μετὰ τὸ γινώσκειν καὶ πεπαιδεύσθαι τοὺς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λόγους, διώξεις καὶ ἐπιζητήσεις τὸ δίκαιον, καθαρεύων πάσης προσπαθείας· καὶ ταύτῃ τὸ δίκαιον δίκαιος ὢν ζητήσεις, καὶ πανταχόθεν περιπεφραγμένος, καὶ ἔσω τῶν ὄρων τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἰστάμενος. Πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτ(ῶ) τ(ῶ) ἐθέλουν δίκαιοι εἶναι, μεθυσθέντες τὸν νοῦν διὰ τῆς [δικαιοσύνης] ἀκριβοῦς αὐτῶν δικαιοσύνης, τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἡδίκησαν. "Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ συνετὸς Ἐκκλησιαστής, μᾶλλον δὲ ὁ τῆς συνέσεως παιδευτής (Χριστὸς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἀληθὴς Ἐκκλησιαστής, τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἡ κεφαλὴ, καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρός ἡμῶν ἡ ἀνωτάτω καὶ ἐνυπόστατος σοφία καὶ λόγος), ἄγχων τὸ πέρα μέτρου, κἂν ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ φέρηται, παραινεί: Μὴ γίνου δίκαιος πολὺ, καὶ μὴ σοφίζων περισσά. The necessity of the first emendation was already realized by the editor in MSG. To me, also the deletion of the first δικαιοσύνης seems quite inevitable because of the word order, as an attributive adjective ἀκριβὴς cannot stand behind δικαιοσύνη without article.

³⁴ MSG 17, 185B: Τὴν σοφίαν ἐνταῦθα δισσῶς ἐπιλαβεῖν, τὴν ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φημι ἐν λόγοις καὶ γραφῇ δοθεῖσαν τοῖς θεόφροσιν, δι' ἧς καὶ ἡ ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐγνωρίσθη· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐνυπόστατον Υἱὸν καὶ Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν ἐξ οὐκ ὄντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγόντα τὰ σύμπαντα τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

as a Spirit-given attribute of the believers' souls and the substantial one, the second person of the Trinity and Son of God himself, who is the personified wisdom of the father. Just like later authors from Cyril of Jerusalem onwards, Origen would thus have used or even introduced our term in order to signify the substantial independence of the Son qua word and wisdom, not only from the believers but also from the father. The justification for attributing this remarkable anticipation to him can, in my opinion, be provided in the light of parallels surviving only in Latin translation. Looking there for a possible equivalent for ἐνυπόστατος, one will turn most plausibly to the occurrences of *substantialis*³⁵ or *substantivus*,³⁶ as ὑπόστασις was rendered by *substantia* or *subsistentia*. The latter only occurs in *De principiis* I 7,1 (86,20f. Koetschau), where the invisible things created through Christ according to Col. 1:16 are interpreted as "incorporeae substantivaeque virtutes", i.e. angels. To me it seems a quite probable hypothesis that Origen called those ἀσώματοι καὶ ἐνυπόστατοι δυνάμεις. The former occurs a number of times in Rufinus' translations in many different contexts and

³⁵ Cf. e.g. Ambrose, *Expositio in Lucam* 1, 5,61 (ed. M. Adriaen, Turnhout 1957 [CCL 14], 8): "non prolatium uerbum, sed substantiale signatur uerbum illud, quod caro factum est et habitauit in nobis". On the opposition cf. bel. nn. 67–70.

³⁶ Apparently, this became the standard translation for our term in the late fourth and fifth century and thus entered the technical trinitarian terminology of Latin theologians: Filastrius Brixensis, *Diversarum hereseon liber* 64,1ff. (ed. V. Bulhart, Turnhout 1957 [CCL 9], 243: Paulus quidam fuit samosatenus post hos in syria, qui uerbum dei, id est christum deum dei filium substantium ac personalem et sempiternum esse cum patre denegabat, prolatium autem, id est quasi aera quendam dicebat, non tamen personam uiuam filii sempiternam cum sempiterno patre credendam docebat.); Faustinus Luciferanus, *De trinitate* 12,43 (ed. R. Simonetti, Turnhout 1967 [CCL 69], 306); Ambrose, *De patriarchis* 11,55 (ed. C. Schenkl, Wien 1897 [CSEL 32/2], 156,15); Hilary, *De trinitate* X,21 (ed. P. Smulders, Turnhout 1980 [CCL 62A], 474: Sed uolentes unigenitum Deum, qui in principio apud Deum erat Deus uerbum, non substantium Deum esse sed sermonem uocis emissae, ut quod loquentibus est suum uerbum, hoc sit Patri Deo Filius, argute subripere uolunt, ne subsistens uerbum Deus et manens in forma Dei Christus homo natus sit: ut cum hominem illum humanae potius originis causa, quam spiritalis conceptionis sacramentum animauerit, non Deus uerbum hominem se ex partu uirginis efficiens extiterit, sed ut in profetis Spiritus profetiae, ita in Iesu uerbum Dei fuerit.); Rufinus of Aquileia, *Expositio symboli* 7 (CCL 20, 143f.); Rufinus the Syrian, *Libellus fidei* 1 (MSL 48, 451A: Hoc est nostra fides [...] quod unus est Deus habens Verbum substantivum, aequale per omnia sibi, et Sapientiam substantivam, aequale sibi per omnia.) and 59 (487B); Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium* 18, ACO I/1/5, 28,12–14; Niceta of Remesiana, *De spiritus sancti potentia* 7, ed. A.E. Burn, Cambridge 1905, 26,7–15; Ps-Athanasius, *De trinitate* VII (MSL 62, 286BC). There seems to be, however, also a genuinely Latin tradition of calling the second and third trinitarian person 'substantivae', as already Tertullian does it in *Adversus Praxean* VII,5–9 and XXVI,6 (ed. A. Kroymann/E. Evans, Turnhout 1954 [CCL 2], 1166f.1197).

thus probably renders quite a variety of terms or prepositional phrases.³⁷ However, in IV 4,3 (352,17 f.) we encounter a phrase strongly reminiscent of the Deuteronomy fragment, when the son is called “verbum dei et sapientia eius ac *substantialis* veritas ac vita”. And finally a beautiful parallel for the Proverbs fragment can be found in I 2,2 (28,13–29,3), where Origen harshly attacks the modalistic misunderstanding that God’s wisdom might be “insubstantivum” (ἀνυπόστατον) and emphasizes that it has to be “a certain thing which makes wise” and that “the only-begotten son of God is his substantially subsisting wisdom” (unigenitum filium dei sapientiam eius esse substantialiter subsistentem).³⁸ Just as in the Proverbs fragment, Origen’s concern is to secure the independence of the principle of the believers’ knowledge as a hypostasis of its own, the son of God himself, who cannot be just a dependent aspect of the father without proper subsistence. That he actually did use our term here is, however, rather unlikely: “substantialiter subsistens” most probably translates οὐσιωδῶς ὑπάρχων or perhaps κατ’ οὐσίαν ὑφ’εστῶς.³⁹

1.2.3. *Origin and the Genuine Meaning(s) of the Term*

Thus we can be pretty certain that our term originated in Christian circles in Origen’s time or shortly before, designed as a new positive counterpart to ἀνυπόστατος, which was quite common already in classical pagan literature. Just like ὑπόστασις / ὑφίσταμαι developed its basic meaning from “sediment, foundation” to “substantial reality” within the first centuries BC and CE,⁴⁰ ἀνυπόστατος means “irresistible” in Plato, “without sure foundation” in Polybius and “unsubstantial” in some Stoic and later philosophers.⁴¹ Where pagan literature offers ὑπόστατος, ὑποστατικός, ὑφ’εστῶς⁴² or something else

³⁷ The variety of possible Greek expressions for “substantial independence” can be seen e.g. from the Eusebius passage quoted below (n. 75).

³⁸ Cf. the similar treatment of the predicate “vapour” (Sap 7:25) in I 2,9 (esp. 40,5–11 Koet.).

³⁹ Cf. the Proverbs-fragment (MSG 17,185A: Οὐσία οὐσα ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφία, πρὸ αἰώνων γέγενηται, καὶ πρὸ κτίσεως αἰδῖος ἦν· ὅτε δὲ σχέσιν πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ ἐδέξατο, τότε ἀρχὴ τῶν ὁδῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ γέγονε τῶν ποιητικῶν καὶ προνοητικῶν· σύζυγος οὖν ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῖς κτίσμασιν ὧν γέγονεν ἀρχή, τουτέστιν ἡ πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ σχέσις· ἡ δὲ σοφία αἰδῖος, οὐσιωδῶς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχουσα.) and bel. at n. 75.

⁴⁰ Cf. H. Dörrie, “Υπόστασις. Wort und Bedeutungsgeschichte”, in: *Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, (13–69) esp. 32 ff.

⁴¹ Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. (col. 168a).

⁴² Cf. Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* V,17,8, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin 1986 (PTS 25), 185 (Against the Peratai): οὐδεὶς οὖν, φησί, δύναται σωθῆναι οὐδ’ ἀνελθεῖν (εἰ μὴ) διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν ὁ ὄφρις· ὡς γάρ, (φησί), κατήνεγκεν ἀνωθεν τοὺς πατρικοὺς χαρακτήρας, οὕτως πάλιν ἐντεῦθεν ἀναφέρει τοὺς ἐξυπνισμένους καὶ γεγονότας (μνηστήρας) πατρικοὺς χαρακτήρας, ὑποστατοὺς

which is not derived from the same root as a positive counterpart to the term at this final stage of its development, Christians might have used the more exactly corresponding *ἐνυπόστατος* instead, apparently from the beginning both in a broader, non-technical and in a narrower sense which soon developed into a technical term of trinitarian theology.

If one examines the broader use of the term from Origen's Deuteronomy fragment onwards (PGL A 2: "real, concrete, actual"), one often gets the impression of an immediate connection with biblical exegesis, as it is used to emphasize the son's belonging to the father: this person, presented to us by the gospel, is nothing but God's personified word or wisdom itself. The biblical inspiration of this use of the term is quite obvious: Jesus Christ is called *δύναμις καὶ σοφία ἐνυπόστατος* (1 Cor 1:24),⁴³ *ζωὴ ἐνυπόστατος* (John 11:25; 14:6),⁴⁴ *ἀλήθεια ἐνυπόστατος* (John 14:6),⁴⁵ *δικαιοσύνη ἐνυπόστατος* (1 Cor

ἐκ τοῦ ἀνυποστάτου ἐντεῦθεν ἐκεῖ μεταφέρων. / Synesius Alchemista (4th century), *Ad Dioscurum in librum Democriti* (ed. M. Berthelot and C.É. Ruelle, *Collection des anciens alchimistes grecs*, vol. 2. Paris 1888 [repr. London 1963], 62): 'Ενόησας, Διόσκορε· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ κηρὸς, οἶον δ' ἂν προσλαμβάνῃ χρώμα δέχεται, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ὑδράργυρος, φιλόσοφε, αὕτη λευκαίνει πάντα, καὶ πάντων τὰς ψυχὰς ἔλκει, καὶ ἐψεί αὐτὰ καὶ ἐπισπᾶται. Διοργανιζομένη οὖν καὶ ἔχουσα ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὰς ὑγρότητας πάντως, καὶ σήψιν ὑφισταμένη ἀμείβει πάντως τὰ χρώματα, καὶ ὑποστατικὴ γίνεται, ἀνυποστάτων αὐτῶν ὑπαρχόντων. μᾶλλον δέ, ἀνυποστάτου αὐτῆς ὑπαρχούσης τότε καὶ κατόχιμος γίνεται ταῖς οἰκονομίαις ταῖς διὰ τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τῶν ὕλων αὐτῶν. In Cyril's *Thesaurus* we find apart from our term ὑποστατικός and οὐσιωδής (MSG 75, 101B–D), in the Ps-Athanasian *Sermo in annuntiationem deiparae* the λόγος ὑποστατικός is contrasted to a mere λόγος προφορικός (MSG 28, 921C/D), and also Ps-Athanasius and Didymus use ὑπόστατος in relevant contexts (cf. Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. [1461b]).

⁴³ Apart from the Origen passage quoted above, cf. esp. Cyril of Alexandria's use of *δύναμις ἐνυπόστατος* (bel. nn. 117–119) and Theophilus of Alexandria, *Homilia de mystica coena* (CPG 2617; MSG 77, 1017C), where the primary biblical reference is, however, Prov 9:1. The same homily also calls the son—in alluding to Hbr 1:3—λόγος καὶ χαρακτήρ ἐνυπόστατος τοῦ Πατρὸς (ibid., 1020A). On the importance of this verse for the technical debates on our term cf. bel. nn. 94–96 and 107f.

⁴⁴ Ps-Athanasius, *De st. Trinitate dialogus* V, 25 (ed. A. Capone, Leuven 2011, 158: Καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκ Πατρὸς φύσιν ζωοποιήσει ἡμᾶς, ἐπειδὴ ζωὴ ἐστὶν ἐνυπόστατος μορφωθείσα τῇ τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ.) and John Chrysostomos, *Homily* 5 in John 1:3 (MSG 59, 57D: 'Επειδὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἂν εὐκόλως ἐνόησέ τις τῶν πολλῶν, πῶς ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ ἐνυπόστατος ἡ ζωὴ, πρότερον μὲν ἐκεῖνο εἶπε τὸ ταπεινότερον, ἔπειτα δὲ παιδευθέντας πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλότερον ἄγει. Ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν, ὅτι 'Ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ ζῶν ἔχειν, οὗτος πάλιν φησὶν, 'Εγὼ εἰμι ἡ ζωὴ· καὶ πάλιν, 'Εγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς), which might, however, also be counted as example of the technical usage. Qua "personified life" Christ can be contrasted to both the derivative lives of the creatures ('doxological use') and the anhypostatical power of death ('technical use') also later in Romanos Melodos, *Hymn* 45, 12 (ed. J. Grosdidier de Matons, Paris 1967 [SC 128], 590): ζωὴ δὲ ἐνυπόστατος ἐγὼ πέλω ὁ ποιήσας τὰ σύμπαντα, ἀλλὰ σὺ "Αἰδὼ τὸ πρὶν οὐκ ἦς οὐδὲ θανάτου ὑπόστασις.

⁴⁵ Asterius Sophista, *Homily* 21, 21 in Ps. 11, 2b LXX (*Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt*, ed. M. Richard, Oslo 1956, 169: "Ὡσπερ δὲ εἰς ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ πολλοὶ οἱ Χριστοὶ—Μὴ ἄπτεσθε τῶν χριστῶν μου—καὶ μία δικαιοσύνη καὶ πολλαὶ αἱ δικαιοσύναι—

1:30)⁴⁶ and finally—most important—λόγος ἐνυπόστατος (John 1). Whereas the meaning of ἐνυπόστατος in the first five titles clearly is “personified x”⁴⁷ or “x itself”, it is not that easy to see why exactly the term Logos has to be specified this way. The probably most obvious explanation would be that the specification is supposed to distinguish Jesus Christ, the personified word of God, from other, non-personal words of God like e.g. the old-testament law (cf. John 1:17)⁴⁸ or the preaching of the church. Yet, most of the passages the title occurs in show no distinction from other words of God at all, neither explicitly nor implicitly. Where it does not occur in a doxological row of titles⁴⁹ or stress the independent personal subsistence of the trinitarian persons according to the technical use, the context mostly deals with the substantial equality of father and son. The ἐνυπόστατος λόγος of the father is the one which truly proceeds from him, exists in him and is of equal glory and power, truly and undeniably God the Son, wisdom, power and word of the Father. The connotation of truth and authenticity inherent in “personified Logos” or “Logos himself” becomes the dominant aspect in the meaning of the term (John 14:9).⁵⁰

Δίκαιος κύριος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἡγάπησεν—οὕτω καὶ μιᾶς οὔσης τῆς ἐνυποστάτου ἀληθείας, πολλὰ λέγονται ἀλήθειαι καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας δόγματα καὶ τὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς πολιτείας ποικίλα θεσπίσματα).

⁴⁶ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* IV,7; ed. Reischl/Rupp, vol. 1, 96: Πίστευε δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν ἕνα καὶ μόνον, [...] τὴν σοφίαν Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐνυπόστατον, τὸν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων καθεζόμενον.

⁴⁷ According to Ps-Athanasius, the Apollinarians called the created intellect ἀμαρτία ἐνυπόστατος, i.e. personified sin (MSG 26, 1129B: Καὶ τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν κατὰ μετάφρασιν, ποτὲ μὲν νοῦν παράφρονα ὀνομάζοντες, ποτὲ δὲ ἀμαρτίαν ἐνυπόστατον, ποτὲ δὲ, ὡς ἐργάτιν τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἐξωθεῖτε) and, according to Didymus the Blind, a judge is “the living, i.e. substantial and personified justice” (*Commentarii in Zacchariam* II, 139,1f.; SC 84, 139: δικαστὴν ἔμψυχον δίκαιον εἶναι, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἐνοῦσιον καὶ ἐνυπόστατον).

⁴⁸ Cf. Irenaeus, fr. 19 (ab. n. 29)/ Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 94,3; ed. K. Holl, vol. 1, Leipzig 1915 (GCS 25), 115 (εἶχον δὲ πᾶσαι αἱ γραφαὶ σποράδην τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς ἀναστάσεως, ἐτήρειτο δὲ τὸ τέλειον τῇ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐνυποστάτου Λόγου παρουσίᾳ)/ Cyril of Alexandria, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, ed. E. Pusey, vol. I, Oxford 1872 (repr. Brussels 1965), 569: ῥῆμα γὰρ Θεοῦ καὶ ὁ νόμος ἦν, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐνυπόστατον, ὥσπερ οὖν ἔστιν ὁ Υἱός. Cf. also Epiphanius, *Panarion* 69, 21; ed. K. Holl, vol. 3, Leipzig 1933 (GCS 37), 171: Ἐφημεν δὲ ὅτι πολλὰ τινες αἱ καταχρηστικῶς (λεγόμεναι) κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ δοθεῖσαι σοφαί, ὅτι πάντα ὁ θεὸς ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐπιτελεῖ. μία δὲ ἔστιν ἡ οὐσα σοφία τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ ἐνυπόστατος θεὸς λόγος.

⁴⁹ The best example is probably Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 19,1 (GCS 25, 27): Αὐτὸς τοίνυν ὁ ἅγιος Λόγος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐνυπόστατος, ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ ἐπουράνιος, ὁ υἱὸς ὁ γνήσιος, ὁ αἰὶ (ᾧν) σὺν πατρὶ, ὁ ἐκ πατρὸς προελθὼν, τὸ “ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως”, “ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς” ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, ὁ σύνθρονος τοῦ φύσαντος ...

⁵⁰ Cf. the vicinity of ἐνυπόστατος to ἀλήθεια-derivatives in Origen’s Deuteronomy fragment (cf. ab. n. 33)/ Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 10,5 (GCS 25, 18: πατὴρ ἀληθινὸς ἐνυπόστατος καὶ υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐνυπόστατος καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθινὸν ἐνυπόστατον); 19,1 (last note); *Panarion* 76,29 (GCS 37, 378f.: ἡ ἀξία τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ἐνυποστάτου Θεοῦ λόγου καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς ἀνάρχως ὁμοουσίως

The narrower and rather technical use (PGL A/B/C 1: “being a hypostasis, having independent existence”) somehow presupposes this broader one in stressing the substantial and personal independence from the father which the Logos has despite his close affiliation to him. In the first Origen passage, it is not the second type of wisdom but the Son and Logos who receives the attribute ἐνυπόστατος, which is thus indirectly transferred also to the wisdom by identifying it with the Son.

Yet, although in the majority of cases the term actually refers to one of the trinitarian persons, its application is by no means limited to such contexts: In the broader meaning it is also applied to the “true” resurrection, the “real” hope, which really has a hypostasis (a proper reality) as an object⁵¹ and to “true” or “efficient” spiritual actions which will yield a proper outcome: Makarios/Symeon demands from the believers a πνευματική και ἐνυπόστατος ἐργασία, i.e. spiritual and true/efficient ascetic labour,⁵² Gregory of Nyssa calls the occupation with the true good a πρᾶγμα ἐνεργόν τε καὶ ἐνυπόστατον,

(τε) γεγεννημένου); 76,35 (ibid. 385: οὐ χρόνῳ ὑποπεσών, ἀλλ’ ἅμα πατέρα ἔχων ἀληθινῶς καὶ ἅμα τὸν πατέρα υἱὸν ἔχειν ἀληθινῶς, οὐκ ἀ[πο]πρεποῦντα πατρί, οὐ τὸ ἀσύγκριτον ἀφανίζοντα. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ σωματικὴ τις διαστολή, ἀλλὰ λόγος ἐνυπόστατος, υἱὸς ἐκ πατρὸς ὦν, πνεῦμα ἐκ πνεύματος καὶ θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ). Cf. the following passages not referring to the Son: Epiphanius, *Panarion* 70,6 (GCS 37, 238: ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀληθῶς θεὸν ἐπιστάμεθα, ἀληθῆ καὶ ὄντα ἀληθῶς ἐνυπόστατον βασιλέα) / John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in principium Actorum* 4,7 (MSG 51, 107B: μηδὲ φαντασίαν, ἀλλ’ ἀληθῆ καὶ ἐνυπόστατον ἀνάστασιν); id. (?), *In catenas St. Petri* 19 (ed. E. Batareikh, Discours inédit sur les chaînes de S. Pierre attribué à S. Jean Chrysostome, in: Χρυσόστομικά 3, Rome 1908: Βαβαὶ χάριτος ἀποστολικῆς καὶ ἐλπίδος ἐνυποστάτου καὶ ἀληθοῦς). Hence, according to the second pseudo-Athanasian dialogue, the Father generates a “real god”, because he generates form his substance and is father essentially (C. Bizer, *Studien zu pseudathanasianischen Dialogen. Der Orthodoxos und Aetios*, Dissertation, Bonn 1970, 91: ἀλλὰ θεὸς ὦν καὶ αὐτοδόξα ἀπαύγασμα ἔχει γέννημα θεὸν ἐνυπόστατον. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ἐγέννησεν, οὐδὲ πατὴρ ἐστὶ κατ’ οὐσίαν).

⁵¹ Cf. the last two notes. The opposite would in both cases be “imaginary” or “fictional”, just as in one passage from Chrysostom, where he explains that Paul in 1 Cor 3:15 does not talk ὡς περὶ ἐνυποστάτων διαλεγόμενος καὶ ἰδίᾳ καιομένων, i.e. about people really burning separately from their works, but only uses a figure of speech to frighten the evildoers (PG 61, 79B, corrected according to *Catenae Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 5, ed. J.A. Cramer, Oxford 1841, 62).

⁵² *Homily* 18; ed. H. Berthold/E. Klostermann, TU 72 [1961], 96,16–24 (ἡμεῖς τοῖνυν, ἀγαπητοί, πάντοτε τὸν σκοπὸν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὸν πόνον ἐκεῖ ἔχωμεν μηδεμίαν ὥραν διδόντες ἑαυτοῖς ἄνεσιν καὶ μῆτε ἐν μικρῷ μῆτε ἐν μεγάλῳ πράγματι ὑπακούσωμεν ταῖς συμβουλίαις αὐτοῦ, ὅπως ἐκέλη ἡ πνευματικὴ καὶ ἐνυπόστατος ἐργασία γένηται ἐν ἡμῖν ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν κακίαν. λόγοι γὰρ μύριοι οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦσιν, ἐργασίας πνευματικῆς χρεῖα ἐνυποστάτου. ἄλλος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγον ἀκούων καὶ χαροποιούμενος καὶ ἄλλος ὁ ἐνέργειαν θείας δυνάμεως αἰσθανόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ, δι’ οὗ ἀποκτεννεται ἡ ἁμαρτία) and 98,14–18 (Παρακαλέσωμεν οὖν τὸν κύριον καὶ προσδοκήσωμεν αὐτὸν ἀδιστακτῶ πίστει, ὅπως ἡ ἐνυπόστατος ἐργασία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος γένηται ἐν ἡμῖν ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα ἐντεῦθεν καθαρισθέντες καὶ ἁγιασθέντες ἀξιοί τῆς ἐπουρανοῦ βασιλείας γενώμεθα).

i.e. an efficient occupation dealing with or yielding proper reality⁵³ or πάγιόν τι καὶ ἐνυπόστατον, i.e. a reliable and real/efficient thing.⁵⁴ Mark the Monk calls the godgiven affliction “a real work of piety”⁵⁵ and in interpreting Jesus’ prohibition of sorrow distinguishes from the latter the “real sin” beneath it, the darkness of the soul.⁵⁶ G.M. de Durand, who translates the term as “très solide” in the first and “bien concret” in the second instance, also expresses the intuition that the term signifies the hypostatical reality of the object of the action. In case of the third instance in Mark, however, where the word of God is called (following Hbr 11:1) “sure foundation (ὑπόστασις) of the things hoped for” and “reliable/true conviction of godlessness for the unbelievers and fornicators”, his complicated translation “elle est, avec une réalité substantielle, un reproche contre leur athéisme”⁵⁷ obscures the rather plain meaning of the phrase.

Most probably according to the more specific sense, Origen already called the Angels “personified powers”,⁵⁸ and several fourth-century authors deny “substantial independence” to evil.⁵⁹ Accordingly, we see the Apollinarian

⁵³ *In Eccl.* V (ed. P. Alexander, Leiden 1962 [GNO V], 354,21f.): καὶ οὕτως ὑποδεῖκνυσιν τὸ ὄντως αἰρετόν, τὸ ἀληθῶς ἐπιθυμητόν, οὗ ἡ σπουδὴ πρᾶγμα ἐστὶν ἐνεργόν τε καὶ ἐνυπόστατον, εἰς αἷε παραμένον τοῖς μετιούσι, πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὸ μάταιον ἐννοίας κεχωρισμένον.

⁵⁴ *De beatitudinibus* VIII,4 (ed. J.F. Callahan, Leiden 1992, [GNO VII/2], 120,5–10): Τοῦτο τοῖνυν τὸ ὑψηλὸν δόγμα παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου μανθάνομεν, ὅτι μόνῃ ἡ κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἡμῖν ἐγγινομένη σπουδὴ πάγιόν τί ἐστι καὶ ἐνυπόστατον. Ὁ γάρ τι τῶν ὑψηλῶν κατορθώσας, ὅσον σωφροσύνην, ἢ μετριότητα, ἢ τὴν πρὸς τὸ Θεῖον εὐσέβειαν, ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν ὑψηλῶν τε καὶ εὐαγγελικῶν διδασμάτων, οὐ παροδικὴν ἐφ’ ἐκάστῳ τῶν κατορθωμάτων καὶ ἄστατον τὴν εὐφροσύνην ἔχει, ἀλλ’ ἐνιδρυμένην καὶ διαμένουσαν, καὶ παντὶ συμπαρατεινομένην τῷ τῆς ζωῆς διαστήματι.

⁵⁵ *De lege spirituali* 65 (ed. G.M. de Durand, Paris 1999 [SC 445], 90): Πᾶσα θλιψὶς κατὰ Θεὸν ἔργον ἐστὶν εὐσεβείας ἐνυπόστατον· ἡ γὰρ ἀληθινὴ ἀγάπη δι’ ἐναντίον δοκιμάζεται.

⁵⁶ *De his qui putant se ex operibus iustificari* 211,8 (SC 445, 198): Ὁ δὲ τοῖς λογισμοῖς περιεχόμενος πῶς ἴδῃ τὴν ὑπὸ τούτων καλυπτομένην ἁμαρτίαν ἐνυπόστατον, ἥτις ἐστὶ σκότος καὶ ὁμίχλη ψυχῆς, ἐξ ἐννοιῶν πονηρῶν καὶ λόγων καὶ πράξεων ἐμπεσοῦσα.

⁵⁷ *De paenitentia* 2,7 (SC 445, 218): ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς βασιλείας ἐπέχει δύναμιν, γενόμενος τοῖς πιστοῖς ἐπιζοιόμενος ὑπόστασις, ἀρραβῶν τῆς μελλούσης κληρονομίας, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν αἰώνων ἀγαθῶν, τοῖς δὲ ἀπίστοις καὶ βεβήλοις ἐνυπόστατος ἀθείας ἐλεγχος.

⁵⁸ Cf. ab. before n. 37.

⁵⁹ Basil, *Quod Deus non est auctor malorum* (MSG 31, 341C: Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ὕφεστῶς, ὥσπερ τι ζῶν, ἡ πονηρία· οὔτε οὐσίαν αὐτῆς ἐνυπόστατον παραστήσαι ἔχομεν) / Epiphanius, *Panarion* 24,6 (GCS 25, 263: οὔτε γάρ ποτε (τὸ) κακὸν ἦν οὔτε ῥίζα γέγονε κακίας οὔτε ἐνυπόστατον τὸ κακὸν ἐστίν. οὐκ ἦν γάρ ποτε τὸ κακόν, ἐπέσκατον δὲ διὰ προφάσεως ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ποιούντων τὸ κακὸν ἔνεστιν· ἐν δὲ τῷ μὴ ποιοῦντι οὐκ ἔστιν [...] ἄρα οὖν ἐν τῷ πάντα ἀνθρωπῶν δύνασθαι μὴ ποιεῖν τὸ κακὸν καὶ δύνασθαι ποιεῖν τὸ κακόν, ὅταν μὲν ποιῇ, ἔστι τὸ κακόν, ὅταν δὲ μὴ ποιῇ, οὐκ ἔστι τὸ κακόν. ποῦ τοῖνυν τοῦ κακοῦ ἐστίν ἡ ῥίζα ἢ ἡ ὑπόστασις τῆς πονηρίας;) / Macarius/Symeon, *Homily* 16,11–13,77 f., in: *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, ed. H. Dörries, E. Klostermann and M. Krüger, Berlin 1964 (PTS 4), 158,160 / Didymus, frg. 26 l. 2 in Ps. 5,5–7, in: *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*, ed. E. Mühlberg, Berlin 1975 (PTS 15), 132,1f. In

treatise *Quod unus sit Christus* transferring the trinitarian application of our term to the Logos into an anthropological context in advancing the assertion that—unlike the Logos—the human element of the Christological mixture actually depends on the former in its hypostatical reality,⁶⁰ i.e. needs a celestial intellect in order to become a truly human person. This argument is in turn contradicted by Epiphanius, according to whom an identification of Christ's hypostasis with his (heavenly, non-human) intellect would in consequence split up any ordinary human being into at least three hypostases, as both soul and body have to be ἐνυπόστατα as well due to their hypostatical separation in death.⁶¹ On a similar line, Macarius contends that in its mixture with evil the soul loses its hypostatical independence (cf. 1 Cor 6:16), yet regains it in the moment of penance.⁶²

To sum up, the only thing we can say with a certain plausibility about the origin of our term is that it probably belonged to Origen's technical trinitarian vocabulary, although he apparently used it also in a wider, less technical

contrast, Macarius also calls the created reality ἐνυπόστατος, i.e. hypostatically real (Homily 4, 169: "simple bodies ἐνυπόστατα by the creator's will"). For further occurrences of our term in this context cf. bel. nn. 111 and 141.

⁶⁰ *Quod unus sit Christus* 10 (*Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen*, ed. H. Lietzmann, Tübingen 1904, 301): "Nobody who is mentally sane and at all capable of being sober and think would ever claim, that just as the perfect and hypostatic Logos did not need the flesh in order to be perfect, the body did not need the Logos, in order to become a hypostatic human being as well".

⁶¹ *Ancoratus* 77.5 (GCS 25, 96 f.): εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶ νοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα νοῦς, ὥς καὶ αὐτοὶ νομιζοῦσι, ψυχὴ δὲ ἄλλη (ὑπόστασις) παρὰ τὸν νοῦν καὶ παρὰ τὸ πνεῦμα, οὐκέτι δύο ὑποστάσεις ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν μιᾷ συναγόμεναι ὑποστάσει, οὐκέτι ἐνυπόστατος μόνῃ ψυχῇ καὶ ἐνυπόστατον τὸ σῶμα, ἀλλ' εὐρήκαμεν λοιπὸν τέσσαρα· νοῦν μίαν ὑπόστασιν, ψυχὴν ἄλλην ὑπόστασιν, πνεῦμα ἄλλην ὑπόστασιν, σῶμα ἄλλην ὑπόστασιν. The passage and its context is corrupted and thus notoriously difficult. Its discussion in O. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius v. Salamis. Ein Kommentar zum Ancoratus*, Göttingen 2003, 288–292 raises the question whether Epiphanius' Apollinarian opponents actually did postulate (as Kösters supposes following Richard) a distinction between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον. This supposition is in my opinion unnecessary: What Epiphanius basically wants to say is that we must not take every scriptural passage describing different aspects of man as enumerating hypostatically different entities man is made up from. Otherwise, the Psalm-verse he will quote subsequently would establish exactly the (hypostatical) non-identity of Nous and Pneuma he confusingly anticipates in the counter-argument already. That the hypostasis of man is made up of two hypostatically independent realities, soul and body, seems to serve as unquestioned basis of the argument, although this probably would not have been accepted by everybody (cf. the Apollinarian author bel. n. 136).

⁶² Homily 16, 22–26: ἐν ἄλλῃ ὥρα καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ ἐνυπόστατος, μεταμελουμένη ἐφ' οἷς ἔπραξε, καὶ κλαίει καὶ εὐχεταὶ καὶ μνημονεύει θεοῦ. εἰ γὰρ πάντοτε ἦν ἡ ψυχὴ βεβηθισμένη εἰς τὸ κακόν, πῶς ἡδύνατο ταῦτα πράττειν, τοῦ σατανᾶ μηδέποτε θέλοντος εἰς μετάνοιαν ἔρχεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους; The meaning "self-contained" assigned to our term in this passage by PGL s.v. A 1 (485b) is obviously untenable.

sense. Considering the fragmentary character of the literary remains from the third century, we will nevertheless be well advised to refrain from further speculation about the origin and entire range of possible meanings of the term and focus on the development of its technical usage in trinitarian theology and Christology.

CHAPTER TWO

ΕΝΥΠΙΟΣΤΑΤΟΣ AS A TECHNICAL TERM OF TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY

2.1. THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF A TECHNICAL USAGE DURING THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY

2.1.1. *A First Instance of Theological Relevance: The Letter of the Six Bishops*

The first time the term appears in a fairly prominent position was during the controversy around Paul of Samosata. Against the strict monarchianism of Paul, the *Letter of Hymenaeus* wants to maintain that the only begotten Son, God's wisdom, word and power, is truly god (without article!) not by fore-knowledge, but οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει.⁶³ Jesus Christ must not be thought of as a simple human being in whom the divine wisdom decided to reside in some extraordinary way, but as a substantial divine reality in its own right, coeternal with the father, his partner in the work of creation, revelation and salvation from the very beginning. When Col. 1:16 says that everything was created in the Son, one must not regard him as an inferior instrument, idle spectator or ἀνυπόστατος ἐπιστήμη, but as ζῶσα ἐνέργεια καὶ ἐνυπόστατος.⁶⁴ The biblical arguments for this view present a clearly subordinatianist position: Predicates like 'angel', but probably also 'mediator' or 'anointed' cannot be attributed to the father himself, but only to the personified wisdom revealing him to us.⁶⁵ The anointing of Christ was not a temporal act of adoption, but one of Christ's eternal and essential traits:

⁶³ "Eine fingierte Korrespondenz mit Paulus dem Samosatener", ed. E. Schwartz, in: SbBAW 1927 (42–46), 42 (324,21 Turrianus). Schwartz's rejection of the authenticity of this letter (ibid. 49–55) did not gain acceptance in the scholarly discussion since (cf. P. de Navascués, *Pablo di Samosata y sus adversarios. Estudio histórico-teológico del Cristianismo antioqueno en el s. III*, Rome 2004, 29–32). On Paul's alleged modalism cf. the detailed comparison between the testimonies on him, Tertullian and Marcellus in F. Loofs, "Paulus von Samosata. Eine Untersuchung zur altkirchlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte", in: TU 44/5 (1924), (1–346) 204–230.

⁶⁴ "Fingierte Korrespondenz", 43 (326,9f.). Similar combinations are favoured later on by Cyril of Alexandria (cf. bel. nn. 117f.).

⁶⁵ Ibid., 44 (326,21–23): τὸν μὲν γὰρ θεὸν πᾶν ὄλων ἀσεβὲς ἄγγελον νομίσαι καλεῖσθαι, ὁ δὲ

If Christ existed before the eons as God's power and God's wisdom, he also did that as Christ, because he is—despite being perceived according to a very large number of concepts—substantially one and the same entity.⁶⁶

Although our term occurs only once in this letter and is not immediately connected with the phrases emphasizing the substantial independence of the Logos, such a meaning is nevertheless rather clearly intended: As *ἀνυπόστατος*, without proper hypostasis, for the six bishops the Logos would necessarily be dead and ineffective. Its “degree” of independent reality directly corresponds to its degree of effectivity.

2.1.2. A ‘Third Kind’ of Logos: *προφορικός, ἐνδιάθετος, ἐνυπόστατος*

The first author who presents this a little more clearly and explicitly is, as far as I see, Cyril of Jerusalem:

The Father begot the Son, not as in a human being the intellect ‘begets’ a word. For the intellect in us is *ἐνυπόστατος*, but the speech is dispersed through the air and perishes. But we know that Christ was begotten not as a *λόγος προφορικός*, but as the Logos which is *ἐνυπόστατος*, alive, not pronounced by lips and dispersed, but comes from the Father eternally and inexpressably, and was begotten *ἐν ὑποστάσει*.⁶⁷ (Cat. XI,10)

This seems to be the first explicit attempt to employ our term in order to secure the apologetic Logos-concept against a possible modalistic abuse in confronting the Origenist *ἐνυπόστατος* λόγος with the two traditional ‘kinds’, *προφορικός* and *ἐνδιάθετος*. Already Irenaeus had to reproach the Valen-

ἄγγελος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἐστίν, αὐτὸς κύριος καὶ θεὸς ὢν. Although θεός cannot take the article in a predicative position, one can in my opinion nevertheless assume Origen's distinction between θεός and ὁ θεός as standing behind the text (cf. Origen, *Commentary on John* II,2,17, ed. C. Blanc, vol. 1, Paris 1966 [SC 120], 216 f.).

⁶⁶ “Fingierte Korrespondenz”, 46 (330,1–3): εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς καθὸ θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεοῦ σοφία πρὸ αἰώνων ἐστίν, οὕτω καὶ καθὸ Χριστὸς, ἐν γὰρ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὢν τῇ οὐσίᾳ, εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα πολλαῖς ἐπινοίαις ἐπινοεῖται.

⁶⁷ More explicit, but without employing our term in the addition to catechese XVI,3 (ed. Reischl/Rupp, vol. 2, 248 f.): ‘Ἄλλ’ ὥσπερ θεοῦ λόγον ἀκούσαντες οὐκ ἀνυπόστατον τι πρᾶγμα τὸν λόγον ψήθημεν οὔτε ἐκ μαθήσεως ἐγγινόμενον οὔτε μετὰ τὸ προενεχθῆναι διαλυόμενον, οὔτε ἄλλο τι πάσχοντα τοιοῦτον οἷα περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον θεωρεῖται πάθη, ἀλλ’ οὐσιωδῶς ὑφειστώτα προαιρετικὸν τε καὶ παντοδύναμον, οὕτως καὶ πνεῦμα μεμαθηκότες θεοῦ, τὸ συμπαραμαρτοῦν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ φανεροῦν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, οὐ πνοὴν ἄσθματος ἐννοοῦμεν, (ἢ γὰρ ἂν καθαιροῖτο πρὸς ταπεινότητα τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς θείας δυνάμεως, εἰ καθ’ ὁμοιότητα τοῦ ἡμετέρου καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα ὑπονοοῖτο), ἀλλὰ δύναμιν οὐσιώδη, αὐτὴν ἐφ’ ἑαυτῆς ἐν ἰδιαζούσῃ ὑποστάσει θεωρουμένην, οὔτε χωρισθῆναι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἐστίν ἡ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ ᾧ παρομαρτεῖ δυνάμεν, οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἀνύπαρκτον ἀναχθεῖν, ἀλλὰ καθ’ ὁμοιότητα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καθ’ ὑπόστασιν οὐσαν, προαιρετικὴν, αὐτοκίνητον, ἔνεργον ...

tinian Gnostics for considering the true Logos a mere λόγος προφορικός,⁶⁸ which reproach from then on became commonplace in orthodox Christian literature.⁶⁹ On the other hand, the early apologists, especially Theophilus of Antioch, quite keenly identified Christ with the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος of the father in order to maintain the spiritual nature of the son's begetting and defend the latter against any mythological misunderstanding.⁷⁰ Two centuries later, this will be stigmatized as preposterous modalistic heresy. In Eusebius' polemics against Marcellus of Ancyra we have the first instance of a rejection of both sides of the stoic opposition as proper explanations for the essence of the Logos. The second book of his *De ecclesiastica theologia* deals with Marcellus' alleged renewal of the Sabellian heresy. Its eleventh chapter blames Marcellus for calling the Logos sometimes προφορικός, sometimes ἐνδιάθετος λόγος of God, while the fifteenth chapter provides the proof from Marcellus' own works. What Eusebius seems to be particularly upset about is the anthropomorphism of Marcellus' theology, ascribing something like human thought and speech to the eternal and transcendent God.⁷¹ If

⁶⁸ *Adversus haereses* II, 13,8, ed. N. Brox, Freiburg e.a. 1993 (FC 8/2), 102. Cf. M. Mühl, "Der λόγος ἐνδιάθετος und προφορικός von der älteren Stoa bis zur Synode von Sirmium 351", in: *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 7 (1962), (7–56), 47–49. On the philosophical background of the distinction cf. *ibid.* 8–24 (Stoa, Philo, Gnostics). The later third and fourth century is treated very briefly and superficially by Mühl (cf. *ibid.* 52–56: Origen, Hilary, Athanasius, Augustine, Sirmium).

⁶⁹ For references see Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 809b. Of special interest could be the following passage from Origen's commentary in John (I,24): Καὶ ἔστιν ἄξιον ἐπιστῆσαι [...] τὸ τί ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος ὀνομαζόμενος, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπεὶ συνεχῶς ἡρῶνται τῷ. "Ἐξηρεύετο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν", οἴμενοι προφορὰν πατρικὴν οἶνεi ἐν συλλαβαῖς κειμένην εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ὑπόστασιν αὐτῷ, εἰ ἀκριβῶς αὐτῶν πυνθανοίμεθα, οὐ διδάσιν οὐδὲ οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ σαφηνίζουσιν, οὐδέπω φαμέν τοιάνδε ἢ τοιάνδε, ἀλλ' ὅπως ποτὲ οὐσίαν. Λόγον γὰρ ἀπαγγελλόμενον υἱὸν εἶναι νοῆσαι καὶ τῷ τυγχόντι ἐστὶν ἀμήχανον. Καὶ λόγον τοιοῦτον καθ' αὐτὸν ζῶντα καὶ ἦτοι οὐ κεχωρισμένον τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο τῷ μὴ ὑφεστάναι οὐδὲ υἱὸν τυγχάνοντα ἢ καὶ κεχωρισμένον καὶ οὐσιωμένον ἀπαγγελλέωσαν ἡμῖν θεὸν λόγον. On the significance of Ps. 44 for the patristic Logos-concept in general cf. E. Grünbeck, *Christologische Schriftargumentation und Bildersprache. Zum Konflikt zwischen Metapherninterpretation und dogmatischen Schriftbeweistraditionen in der patristischen Auslegung des 44. (45.) Psalms*, Leiden 1994 (on the Origen-passage quoted esp. 60–65).

⁷⁰ *Ad Autolycum* II, 10,2. 22,3, ed. M. Marcovic, Berlin / New York 1995 (PTS 44), 53.70. Cf. Mühl, "Logos", 25–32 (Theophilus and his reception by Tertullian).

⁷¹ Cf. esp. *De ecclesiastica theologia* I, 17,7 (GCS 14, 78) / II, 11,1 (*ibid.*, 112); 14,20 (pp. 117f.); 15,2–4 and J.T. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum. Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*, Washington 1999, 131–134. On the hypostatical independence of Logos and Spirit in Eusebius cf. also H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb v. Caesarea*, Göttingen 1999, 167–174 and 224–230.

the term Logos in John 1 has to be understood “properly and truly”, not καταχρηστικῶς,⁷² Marcellus’ ‘expansion’ of the Godhead, the transgression of the Logos from being “potentially in the Father” to being “actually with God”,⁷³ is nothing but the manifestation of something inside God, undistinguishable from a human utterance of thoughts breaking Marcellus’ “certain silence” before creation.⁷⁴

Eusebius’ own view of the Logos can be beautifully illustrated by a quotation from his commentary on Psalm 57,4c (with reference to 43,3a and 107,20):

The light, the truth and the Logos sent from the highest God are neither without substance (ἀνούσια) nor without hypostasis (ἀνυπόστατα). Just as the Logos is perceived as agent of healing and salvation, he is named ‘mercy’ in our passage, because he is a servant of God’s philanthropy. Accordingly, he is called ‘truth’, because he really subsists (ἀληθῶς ὑφ’εστώς) and is actually substantiated (κατ’ ἐνέργειαν οὐσιωμένος). Our speech which has its hypostasis in syllables, verbs and nouns and is pronounced by tongue and voice will not be called ‘logos’ properly and truly. For it has another logos which ‘begets’ it and which will be called ‘logos’ properly. That one is called the ἐνδιάθετος logos. Hence, just like the ἐνδιάθετος λόγος in us which could also be truly called logos, God’s Logos is hypostatical (ὑπόστατος), substantially subsisting (κατ’ οὐσίαν ὑφ’εστώς), different from the one who sent him.⁷⁵

⁷² Marcellus, *Die Fragmente und der Brief an Julius v. Rom*, ed. M. Vinzent, Leiden 1997, fr. 65 (p. 56) and 94 (p. 84) (= fr. 45f. Klostermann; GCS 14, 193). Cf. Ibid. I,1,2f. (pp. 62f.), where Eusebius argues that Sabellianism consists in calling the second person of the Trinity κυρίως word and only καταχρηστικῶς son.

⁷³ fr. 70 Vinzent (p. 61) (= fr. 52 Klostermann; GCS 14, 194): ἵν’ ἐν μὲν τῷ φῆσαι “ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος” δεῖξῃ δυνάμει ἐν τῷ πατρὶ εἶναι τὸν λόγον (ἀρχὴ γάρ ἀπάντων τῶν γεγονότων ὁ θεὸς “ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα”), ἐν δὲ τῷ “καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν” ἐνεργείᾳ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον (“πάντα” γὰρ “δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν”), ἐν δὲ τῷ θεὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον εἰρηκέναι μὴ διαίρειν τὴν θεότητα, ἐπειδὴ ὁ λόγος τε ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ. “ἐν ἐμοί” γὰρ φησιν “ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ”.

⁷⁴ fr. 76 Vinzent (p. 68) (= fr. 103 Klostermann; GCS 14, 207): πρὸ γὰρ τῆς δημιουργίας ἀπάσης ἡσυχία τις ἦν, ὡς εἰκός, ὄντος ἐν τῷ θεῷ τοῦ λόγου.

⁷⁵ MSG 23, 509A. For Eusebius, this substantial independence does not exclude a reciprocal trinitarian inexistence: καὶ πάλιν οὕτως ἦν ὁ πατήρ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ πατρὶ. ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος καὶ περὶ πάντων διδάσκει τῶν τῆς ἐπουρανίου βασιλείας ἀξίων λέγων. “τότε ἔσται ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν ἡμῖν”, ὡς καὶ τὸ “ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω” λέλεκται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς “ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμεν”. καὶ ταῦτα πάντα περὶ ἡμῶν λέλεκται, τῶν κατ’ ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν ὑφ’εστῶτων καὶ ζώντων καὶ μὴδὲν ἐχόντων κοινὸν πρὸς τὴν πατρικὴν θεότητα. τί διὸ οὖν χρὴ θαυμάζειν, εἰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αἱ παραπλήσιοι φέρονται φωναί, οὐκ ἀναίρουσαι μὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν οὐδ’ αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν διδάσκουσαι, τὴν δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἰδιάζουσαν καὶ ἐξαίρετον τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν τῆς μονογενοῦς καὶ θεικῆς κοινωνίας παριστῶσαι; (*De eccl. theol.* III,20; GCS 14, 181).

To rule out the Marcellian deviation Eusebius uses many expressions equivalent to ἐνυπόστατος in its technical trinitarian sense: ἀληθῶς ὑφεστώς, κατ' ἐνέργειαν οὐσιωμένος, ὑπόστατος (!) and κατ' οὐσίαν ὑφεστώς.

The substantial independence of the Logos expressed by those or similar terms was in fact the crucial point in the Origenists' early anti-marcellian (and anti-athanasian) opposition and in my opinion also the theological context for the growing prominence and technical specification of the term ἐνυπόστατος. This can be shown by a comparison of the early Origenist or homeousian creeds from 341 to 345.

2.1.3. *The Hypostatical Independence of the Logos in the Creeds*

The Dedication council of Antioch (341) offers two corresponding formulas: Theophronius of Tyana's creed (first creed) has θεὸν τέλειον ἐκ θεοῦ τελείου, καὶ ὄντα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει.⁷⁶ The officially ratified creed (second creed) expounds Mt 28:19 the following way:

... obviously of the Father who is truly father, of the Son who is truly son, and of the Holy Spirit who is truly holy spirit, as those names are not given without meaning or function (οὐχ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ ἀργῶς), but as accurately signifying the proper hypostasis, rank and glory of those named by them. Thus, they are three with respect to their hypostasis, but one with respect to their harmony (ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν).⁷⁷

One paragraph of the *Ekthesis Makrostichos* (345) runs:

For we know that he is not just God's λόγος προφορικός or ἐνδιάθετος, but the living God-Logos existing by itself (καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑπάρχοντα), God's Son and Christ, who accompanies and stays with his Father before eons and assists him in the entire creation of both visible and invisible things, yet not as a mere aspect of divine foreknowledge (οὐ προγνωστικῶς).⁷⁸

⁷⁶ J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, Singapore ³1972, 267 (Athanasius, *De synodis* 24; ed. H.G. Opitz, Berlin 1940, 250).

⁷⁷ Ibid., 269 (*De synodis* 23,5–7): καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ εἰς παράκλησιν καὶ ἁγιασμὸν καὶ τελείωσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν διδόμενον, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς διετάξατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς λέγων "πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος", δηλονότι πατρός, ἀληθῶς πατρός ὄντος, υἱοῦ δὲ ἀληθῶς υἱοῦ ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἀληθῶς ἁγίου πνεύματος ὄντος, τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐχ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ ἀργῶς κειμένων, ἀλλὰ σημαίνοντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν οἰκείαν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ὑπόστασιν τε καὶ τάξιν καὶ δόξαν, ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν.

⁷⁸ Athanasius, *De synodis* 26,6; ed. Opitz, 253 (cf. Kelly, *Creeds*, 279 f.). Calling the Son λόγος προφορικός ἢ ἐνδιάθετος is again condemned in the eighth anathema of the second council of Sirmium (351) against Marcellus' pupil Photinus (cf. *De synodis* 27,3; ed. Opitz, 255).

Socrates' text of the creed is already amplified by the gloss: ἀλλ' ἐνυπόστατον Λόγον ὄντα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ.⁷⁹ This glossator shows an accurate awareness of what the point of introducing this term into the trinitarian discussion was: It was an Origenist way to secure the apologetic Logos-terminology against its Marcellian 'abuse'. The Word, wisdom and power of God is not a λόγος οἷος ὁ ἐν καρδίᾳ or a σοφία οἷα ἐν ψυχῇ ἀνθρώπου,⁸⁰ but an eternal divine being ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει, acting αὐτοπροσώπως⁸¹ from creation throughout the history of the world, reigning alongside the father without end. Thus, for the homeousians the Logos of Marcellus corresponds exactly to the ἀνυπόστατος ἐπιστήμη which the six bishops who subscribed to the *Letter of Hymenaeus* claimed Paul of Samosata's Logos to resemble. Not surprisingly, they accused him and his pupil Photinus⁸² not only of Sabellianism, but also of Paulinianism and thus obviously made use—at least at the second council of Sirmium (351)—of anti-paulian documents like the *Letter of Hymenaeus*.⁸³ A similar conservative position, very close to the Cappadocian compromise, can be found in Meletius of Antioch's famous homily, which caused his deposition by the anti-nicene emperor Constantius II., but was not accepted by the Nicene Eustathians either. Meletius confesses:

The Son is and is called Logos, but is not perceived as (mere) voice or word of the Father. For he subsists by himself (ὑφέστηκε γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὸν) and acts, and everything is through and in him. Similarly, he is wisdom and is perceived neither as (mere) thought of the Father nor movement or activity of his intellect, but as offspring of the father, equal to him and his accurate image. For he is the one who was sealed by the Father, God himself, and he does

⁷⁹ *Historia ecclesiastica* II, 19,17; ed. G.C. Hansen, Berlin 1995 (GCS NF 1), 115.

⁸⁰ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 65,3,4 (GCS 37, 5) = Paul of Samosata, fr. 49 Loofs ("Paulus von Samosata", 163).

⁸¹ Cf. *Ekthesis makrostichos* (*De synodis* 26,6; ed. Opitz, 253): ὁ καὶ τοῖς πατριάρχαις αὐτοπροσώπως ὁφθεῖς.

⁸² In the debate between him and Basil of Ancyra at Sirmium II (351), he said according to Epiphanius, *Panarion* 71,2 (GCS 37, 251): οὕτω δὲ ἦν (υἱός), λόγος δὲ ἦν, καθάπερ ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ λόγος. Accordingly, Epiphanius criticizes him in 71,3–5 exactly the way Eusebius argued against Marcellus claiming that God's son and co-creator could neither be his λόγος ἐνδιάθετος nor προφορικὸς (cf. bel. on Epiphanius).

⁸³ Cf. H. de Riedmatten, *Les actes de Paul de Samosate. Étude sur la christologie du IIIe au IVe siècle*, Fribourg 1952, 129–133. The consequence of this association of Marcellus, Photinus and Paul was a severely adulterated concept of Paul's monarchianism which already in Epiphanius is barely distinguishable from Marcellus' modalism; cf. *ibid.* 82–91 and R.M. Hübner, "Die Hauptquelle des Epiphanius (*Panarion*, haer. 65) über Paulus von Samosata: Ps-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos*", in: ZKG 90 (1979), 55–74.

not inhere in something else, nor does he subsist by himself (οὐχ ἐτέρῳ μὲν ἐνυπάρχει, οὐχ ὑφέστηκε δὲ καθ' ἑαυτὸν), but is the active offspring who has created all this and always conserves it.⁸⁴

The creation of God's wisdom (Prv 8:22) and the begetting of his Son (Ps 2:7) are complementary analogies: The Logos is not ἀνυπόστατός τε καὶ ἀνύπαρκτος like human wisdom, but ἐνυπόστατόν τε καὶ μόνιμον like a human son, a created natural entity; but neither is he heterogeneous to his source, like the product of a certain technical know-how, but a unique 'reduplication' of the Father, his only-begotten son, similar to him in every respect.⁸⁵

Of course the Marcellan party did not fail to react. Given that Marcellus himself is the author of the pseudo-Athanasian *Expositio fidei*,⁸⁶ he even explicitly repudiates Eusebius' reproaches saying:

We believe [...] in one only-begotten Logos, wisdom, Son, begotten from the Father eternally and without beginning, not in a λόγος προφορικός, not in a λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, not in an outflow from the perfect one, not in a piece cut off from the impassible nature or an emanation, but in the Son perfect in himself, living and acting, the true image of the Father, equal to him in honour and glory.⁸⁷

Shortly before Marcellus' death (ca. 371), the Marcellian party wrote an *Expositio fidei* to Athanasius seeking his support against Basil of Caesarea. They still do not speak of three hypostases, but at least of a subsisting Triad:

⁸⁴ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73,30 (GCS 37, 305): καὶ ὅτι λόγος ἔστι τε καὶ λέγεται (ὁ) υἱός, οὐ μὴν φωνὴ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲ ῥῆμα νοεῖται. ὑφέστηκε γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα· ὥσπερ καὶ σοφία ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν οὐκ ἐνθύμημα τοῦ πατρὸς νοεῖται, οὔτε κίνησις τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ καὶ ἐνέργεια, ἀλλὰ γέννημα ὁμοῖόν τε τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τὸν χαρακτήρα τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκριβοῦν. τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν, ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐχ ἐτέρῳ μὲν ἐνυπάρχει, οὐχ ὑφέστηκε δὲ καθ' ἑαυτόν(ν), ἀλλὰ γέννημά (ἐστίν) ἐνεργητικόν καὶ πεποιηκὸς τόδε τὸ πᾶν καὶ φυλάττον αἰεὶ.

⁸⁵ Ibid. 73,31 (p. 306f.). The whole homily still makes a slightly subordinationist impression, when it calls the son λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις τοῦ ὑπὲρ σοφίαν καὶ δύναμιν, ὑπὲρ δ φθέγγασθαι δύναται γλῶττα, ὑπὲρ δ κινῆσαι διάνοια (ibid. 73,30; 305).

⁸⁶ This was suggested by F. Scheidweiler ("Wer ist der Verfasser des sog. Sermo major de fide?", in: BZ 47 [1954], [333–357] 356f.) and discussed afterwards quite controversially. The status questionis is presented comprehensively by K. Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, Berlin/New York 1994 (AKG 59), 70–84, who intends to prove the Marcellian authorship of the document mainly from the exegesis of Prov 8,22–25 (ibid., 317–321).

⁸⁷ *Expositio fidei* 1,2, in: *Athanasiana* I, ed. H. Nordberg, Helsinki/Helsingfors 1962, 49. Although Sabellius is explicitly rejected in 2,2; ibid., 51 (οὔτε γὰρ υἱοπάτορα φρονούμεν ὡς οἱ Σαβέλλιοι λέγοντες μονοούσιον καὶ οὐχ ὁμοούσιον καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀναιροῦντες τὸ εἶναι υἱόν) the allegory of source and river in 2,4 conveys a modalist impression by calling father and son δύο σχήματα καὶ δύο ὀνόματα. Moreover, the son's *sessio ad dextram* and reign without end is not mentioned a single time—a striking fact in texts with such a close relation to the creed.

For we are confessing an eternal Father of an existing (ὄν) and subsisting (ὑφεστώς) eternal Son and an eternally existing and subsisting Holy Spirit, as we do not call the Triad ἀνυπόστατον, but conceive of it as ἐν ὑποστάσει.⁸⁸

Four years later, the Marcellian party confesses its orthodox faith to some bishops exiled in Egypt and finally condemns its master's doctrine about God's expansion and contraction, speaking openly of three subsisting realities in God:

We have not thought anything deviating from the Nicene [...] faith, [...] and pronounce accursed [...] everyone who does not regard the holy Triad as three persons who are incomprehensible, ἐνυπόστατα, consubstantial, coeternal and perfect in themselves, just as we pronounce accursed those who call the Son an expansion, contraction or energy of the father, and those who do not confess the God-Logos, the Son of God to be from before the ages, coeternal with the Father and a son and god who is ἐνυπόστατος and perfect in himself.⁸⁹

When Socrates tells us that already Eustathius of Antioch had called the son ἐνυπόστατος καὶ ἐνυπάρχων in a controversy with Eusebius of Cesarea,⁹⁰ he probably rephrases the debate in his own terms, as such a friendly stance towards the hypostatical plurality in the homoousian party cannot be detected before the turning point of 362, when Athanasius' *Tomus ad Antiochenos* provided the basis for a reconciliation between the Origenist three-hypostases theology and the Nicene ὁμοούσιος. According to the confession of the Meletians, the expression 'three hypostases' is acceptable,

because we believe in the Holy Trinity which is not only a triad by name, but a really existing and subsisting one (ἀληθῶς οὖσαν καὶ ὑφεστῶσαν), a really existing and subsisting Father, a really substantially existing and subsisting (ἀληθῶς ἐνούσιον ὄντα καὶ ὑφεστῶτα) Son, and a subsisting and existing (ὑφεστῶς καὶ ὑπάρχον) Holy Spirit.

⁸⁸ *Expositio* 2,4; in: M. Tetz, "Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien. Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasium des Diakons Eugenios von Ankyra", in: ZNW 64 (1973), (75–121) 79,29–32.

⁸⁹ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72,11 (GCS 37, 265 f.): οὐτε φρονούμεν οὐτε πεφρονήκαμεν τί ποτε ἐκτὸς τῆς κατὰ Νίκειαν ὁρίσθεισης οἰκουμενικῆς καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς πίστεως, ἥνπερ ὁμολογοῦμεν ἢ δυνάμει ταύτην φρονεῖν, ἀναθεματίζοντες τοὺς τολμῶντας κτίσμα λέγειν (τὸν υἱὸν ἢ) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν καὶ Σαβελλίου καὶ Φωτεινοῦ καὶ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, καὶ τοὺς μὴ λέγοντας τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα τρία πρόσωπα ἀπερίγραφα καὶ ἐνυπόστατα καὶ ὁμοούσια καὶ συναΐδια καὶ αὐτοτελῆ, ἀναθεματίζοντες δὲ καὶ τοὺς πλατυσμὸν ἢ συστολήν ἢ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱὸν λέγοντας, καὶ τοὺς τὸν θεὸν λόγον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, προαιώνιον καὶ συναΐδιον τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἐνυπόστατον καὶ αὐτοτελῆ υἱὸν καὶ θεὸν μὴ ὁμολογούντας.

⁹⁰ *Historia ecclesiastica* I, 23,8 (GCS NF 1, 70).

Accordingly, the reply of the Eustathians admits that ‘one hypostasis’ is possible, if it is not intended as an “abolition of the Son and the Holy Spirit, as if the Son was unsubstantial (ἀνούσιος) or the Holy Spirit without hypostasis (ἀνυπόστατος)”.⁹¹ This turning point removed every obstacle for a mainstream reception of the Origenist term ἐνυπόστατος in trinitarian theology, as it emerges esp. in Pseudo-Athanasius, Didymus the Blind and later on in Cyril of Alexandria, partly also in John Chrysostom.⁹²

2.2. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TECHNICAL USAGE IN LATE FOURTH- AND EARLY FIFTH-CENTURY AUTHORS

2.2.1. *Ps-Athanasius and Didymus*

Examining the exegesis of Hbr 1:3 in the pseudo-Athanasian dialogues *De trinitate*, one is reminded of the discussion between Eusebius and Marcelinus, whether ‘Son’ or ‘Logos’ has to be understood properly and thus has to form the key concept of Christology.⁹³ According to Ps-Athanasius, δύναμις, σοφία and λόγος have to be interpreted alongside with ἀπαύγασμα as titles emphasizing the consubstantiality of Father and Son, whereas the title Son manifests τὸ ἐνυπόστατον, i.e. that the Son is an οὐσία ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει.⁹⁴

⁹¹ *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5,4–6,1 (*Athanasius Werke* II/8, ed. H.-C. Brennecke e.a., Berlin/New York 2006, 345). The arrangement of the two confessions is most clearly presented by L. Abramowski, “Trinitarische und christologische Hypostasenformeln”, in: *Formula and Context. Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Hampshire 1992, (38–49) 42 f. n. 21 and 23.

⁹² Basil the Great still expresses his anti-modalistic concern mostly in different terms, as e.g. in *epist.* 210,5 (ed. Y. Courtonne, Vol. 2, Paris 1961, 196): Οὐ γὰρ ἐξαρκεῖ διαφοράς προσώπων ἀπαριθμῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ χρὴ ἕκαστον πρόσωπον ἐν ὑποστάσει ἀληθινῇ ὑπάρχον ὁμολογεῖν. Ἐπεὶ τὸν γε ἀνυπόστατον τῶν προσώπων ἀναπλασμόν οὐδὲ Σαβέλλιος παρητήσατο, εἰπὼν τὸν αὐτὸν Θεόν, ἓνα τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ ὄντι πρὸς τὰς ἐκάστοτε παραπιπτούσας χρεῖας μεταμορφούμενον, νῦν μὲν ὡς Πατέρα, νῦν δὲ ὡς Υἱόν, νῦν δὲ ὡς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον διαλέγεσθαι. His brother Gregory of Nyssa uses our term three times in such a way (*Contra Eunomium* III,6,17; ed. W. Jaeger, vol. II, Leiden 1960, 191 f. / *Adv. Macedonianos de spiritu sancto*; ed. F. Mueller, vol. III/1, Leiden 1958, 102,27 f. / *Oratio catechetica* 8; ed. E. Mühlenberg, vol. III/4, Leiden 1996, 35,8–16). Cf. *Lexicon Gregorianum*, ed. F. Mann, Bd. III, Leiden e.a. 2001, 789.

⁹³ Cf. ab. n. 72.

⁹⁴ MSG 28, 1125AB (Ἐνόμοιος. Κἀν δώμεν, ὅτι Παύλου ἐστὶν ἡ Ἐπιστολὴ, ἀλλὰ ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ἔχει τὸ εἶναι, οὐκ ἐν ἰδίᾳ ζωῇ; Ὁρθ. Ἀλλ’ οὐ μόνον εἴρηται χαρακτήρ ὑποστάσεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ Υἱὸς, ἵνα τὸ ἐνυπόστατον νοήσωμεν. Ἀπαύγασμα γὰρ εἴρηται, διὰ τὸ συναϊδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἶναι· χαρακτήρ διὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῆς ὑποστάσεως· Υἱὸς διὰ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον) and 1160B–1161A, esp. 1161A: Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, Υἱὸν ἀκούοντες, τὸ ἐνυπόστατον νοοῦμεν· καὶ δύναμιν ἀκούοντες, καὶ Λόγον, καὶ σοφίαν, τὸ ἀχώριστον καὶ συναϊδίον ἐπαιδεύθημεν. A.I.C. Heron’s discussion of the term in those dialogues (“The two pseudo-athanasian dialogues against the anhomoeans”, in: JThS 34 [1973], [101–122] 114–118) points to the right direction, but does not reject C. Bizer’s suggestion that ἐνυπόστατον could mean something like ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας clearly

Against the Anomoean's objection that the *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως* had its subsistence *ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει* of the Father and not on its own, the Orthodox stresses the substantial independence of the Son and thereby clearly establishes a meaning of *ἐνυπόστατος* diametrically opposed to any kind of insubsistence.

In his use of the term the author of the *De trinitate* attributed to Didymus the blind, who apparently uses the pseudo-Athanasian dialogues as an important source,⁹⁵ seems more concerned about the substantial reality of the Spirit than that of the Son. When he speaks of the *ἐνυπόστατον ἀπαύγασμα καὶ χαρακτήρ*, he rather has in mind the undiminished equality of Father and Son: the Son is the personified and most adequate (*ἐνυπόστατον καὶ ἀψευδέστατον*) simile of the Father's being.⁹⁶ However, speaking about the Spirit he is very eager to stress exactly that kind of substantial independence our previous authors wanted to maintain mainly (of course not exclusively) for the Son.⁹⁷

enough. On the complicated relationship between the all in all ten pseudo-Athanasian dialogues and the *De trinitate* attributed to Didymus cf. now the careful examination of P. Andrist, "Les protagonistes égyptiens du débat apollinariste. Le Dialogue d'Athanase et Zachée et les dialogues pseudoathanasiens", in: *Recherches augustinienes et patristiques* 34 (2005), (63–141) 106–141.

⁹⁵ According to Heron, "Dialogues", 118–122, *De trinitate* is an authentic work of Didymus', but (against A. Günthör) the pseudo-Athanasian dialogues do not belong to him. Didymus' authorship of *De trinitate* was, however, recently contested by M. Simonetti, "Ancora sulla paternità Didimiana del *De trinitate*", in: *Augustinianum* 36 (1996), 377–387. The following editions are available: *Didymus der Blinde: De trinitate, Buch 1*, ed. J. Hönscheid, Meisenheim am Glan 1975 / *De trinitate, Buch 2. Kapitel 1–7*, ed. I. Seiler, Meisenheim am Glan 1975 / II, 8–27 and III only in MSG 39.

⁹⁶ Cf. *De trinitate* I, 16,44, ed. Hönscheid, 98 (ἄλλο δέ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπον εἰκόνα εἶναι θεοῦ, τοὔτεστιν τὸ τεχνῆθεν τοῦ τεχνησαμένου, ὡς δίφρος τοῦ τέκτονος—Σολομὼν γὰρ λέγει· "ἀναλόγως τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ γενεσιουργὸς θεωρεῖται"—, καὶ ἄλλο ἐστὶν κατὰ τὸ σύμμορφον καὶ ταυτοῦσιον καὶ συνάναρχον ἀπαύγασμα εἶναι δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρα ὑποστάσεως ἐνυπόστατον καὶ ἀψευδέστατον); 26,15f., *ibid.*, 160; without reference to Hbr 1:3 also in II, 2,35, ed. Seiler, 36; II, 10 (MSG 39, 648A) and III, 19 (MSG 39, 892A). An antimodalistic exposition of the term 'logos' occurs in his Genesis-commentary (ed. P. Nautin and L. Doutreleau, vol. 1, Paris 1976 [SC 233], 34): πάντα γὰρ [διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγέ]νετο καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐκτίσθη τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς [οὐρανοῖς τὰ ὁρατὰ] καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα· ἐν γὰρ τῷ υἱῷ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκε [καὶ εἰς αὐτόν, ὅς] ἐσ[τ]ι πρὸ πάντων· ἄνευ γὰρ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅς οὐ[τε] προφορικὸς οὐ[τε] ἐνδιάθετός ἐστιν ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, Θεοῦ οὐσ[ι]ώδης τῷ] ὄντι, ο[ὐδ] ἐν ὑποστῆναι δύναται.

⁹⁷ *De trinitate* II, 1,7–9, ed. Seiler, 8–10; II, 8,1 (MSG 39, 616A); III, 37 (MSG 39, 972B). In the first passage, the author possibly draws upon the third pseudo-Athanasian dialogue, where it is discussed with the Macedonian opponent, whether in Ps. 32,6 LXX both the Logos and the Spirit are *ἐνυπόστατοι* collaborators in creation or not (MSG 28, 1240AB). Besides, the hypostatical independence of the Holy Spirit is stressed in the discussion of Christ's inspiration (Is 42:1; John 1:33) towards the end of the first anti-macedonian dialogue (ed. E. Cavalcanti, Torino 1983, § 20,54–65 [p. 106]: Ὁρθ. Δύο Πνεύματα ἔχει ὁ Θεός; Μακεδ.

2.2.2. *Epiphanius of Salamis*

Epiphanius of Salamis is really fond of our term: In his two most important works, *Ancoratus* and *Panarion*, written between 374 and 377, ἐνυπόστατος occurs 74 times, of which only four references belong into a non-trinitarian context.⁹⁸ More than half of the trinitarian references are of antimodalistic intention. Yet, the modalistic misunderstanding of the Logos-concept is neither treated in the chapters against the Valentinian Gnostics, nor in that against Noetus, nor in that against Sabellius, but only in those against Paul of Samosata and Photinus of Sirmium.⁹⁹

Paul and Photinus are of course linked by their adoptianism and their modalism. Both of them express (according to Epiphanius) their modalistic stance in misconceiving the divine Logos anthropomorphistically—a criticism already Eusebius had launched against Marcellus:

That person [Paul] is claiming that God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one God, and that his logos and spirit are always in God, just as a man's proper λόγος is always in his heart. According to him, the Son of God is not ἐνυπόστατος, but (exists) in God himself, just as also Sabellius, Novatianus, Noetus and others claimed.¹⁰⁰

Combined with the misunderstood anthropological analogy, the modalistic use of John 10:38¹⁰¹ becomes particularly dangerous because it renders

Αὐτός ὁ Θεὸς Πνεῦμα ἐστὶ· λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ Πνεῦμα. Ὅρθ. Ἡ δύναμις αὕτη Πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐστίν; Μακεδ. Οὐ. Ὅρθ. Ὁ δὲ Παράκλητος ἐνυπόστατος ἐστὶ; Μακεδ. Ναί. Ὅρθ. Τὸ οὖν ἀνυπόστατον ἔθηκεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον; Μακεδ. Ἀνυπόστατον τί ἐστίν, οὐ νοῶ· τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ εἶπε τίθεναι. Ὅρθ. Τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ, ἣν εἶπε τίθεναι, ἐνυπόστατος ἐστίν. Μακεδ. Αὐτό ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός; and in the later post-neonicean trinitarian exposition (MSG 28, 1604BC): Πνεῦμα δὲ ἀκούων, ἅγιον ἐνυπόστατον νόει. Ἡμῶν μὲν φθαρτῶν ὄντων, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα λυόμενον· τοῦ δὲ ἀθανάτου πάντως τὸ πνεῦμα ἀθάνατον, ὡς οὐσία τις ἐνυπόστατος.

⁹⁸ Cf. ab. nn. 59, 61 and *Panarion* 25,4 (GCS 25, 271: ἐνυποστατικά ἀρχαί). By trinitarian context I mean the reference to one of the trinitarian persons, which could of course occur in treating whatsoever theological topic. On Epiphanius' concept of hypostasis cf. Kösters, *Trinitätslehre*, 365–370.

⁹⁹ In the chapter against Sabellius, an anthropological analogy is mentioned, but not expounded (*Panarion* 62,1; GCS 31, 389). The chapter against Marcellus mainly consists of documents not written by Epiphanius (Macellus' letter to Pope Julius [72,2.f.], Acacius of Caesarea's treatise against Marcellus [72,6–10], the confession of the Marcellians to the Egyptian bishops [72,10.f.]).

¹⁰⁰ *Panarion* 65,1 (GCS 37, 3): Φάσκει δὲ οὗτος θεὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἓνα θεόν, ἐν θεῷ δὲ αἰεὶ ὄντα τὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ ὁ ἴδιος λόγος. μὴ εἶναι δὲ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνυπόστατον, ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ὁ Σαβέλλιος καὶ ὁ Ναυᾶτος καὶ ὁ Νόητος καὶ ἄλλοι. About the misleading introduction of Novatianus see Holl's annotation to l. 13 (p. 3 f.).

¹⁰¹ Cf. *Panarion* 57,4f. (against Noetus; GCS 31, 348f.); 62,2 (against Sabellius; *ibid.* 391): ἐνυπόστατος ὁ πατήρ, ἐνυπόστατος ὁ υἱός, ἐνυπόστατον τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. ἀλλὰ οὐ συναλοιφή ἡ

the Son a mere function, attribute or accident of the Father without proper subsistence. If the Son were in the Father just like human reason is in its possessors, he would be nothing but one of God's transitory manifestations:

If the Logos existed in the beginning, and the Logos was with God, his existence (τὸ εἶναι) is not just κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν, but κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν. [...] For if God has the Logos only in his heart, but not as a begotten one, how can the word 'existed' and the phrase 'God was the Logos' [John 1:1a.c] be maintained? The Logos of a man is not a man who is together with this man. Neither does it live nor does it subsist (ὑπέστη), but it is just the movement of the living and subsisting heart (καρδίας δὲ ζωῆς καὶ ὑφ'εστῶσης) and not a hypostasis. For once it is uttered it suddenly ceases to exist.¹⁰²

Against Photinus' affirmation during the debate with Basil of Ancyra that the Logos in the beginning "was not yet son, but was word, just as the word in my own mind",¹⁰³ Epiphanius also maintains that the Son cannot be just προφορὰ τις [...], ἀλλ' ἐνυπόστατος θεὸς λόγος.¹⁰⁴ Why he uses ἐνυπόστατος only once in chapter 71 and prefers to characterize the eternal Logos with a term like ἔμφυτος, which could suggest exactly the opinion he opposes,¹⁰⁵ is a question I cannot answer.

τριας, ὡς ὁ Σαβέλλιος ἐνόμισεν, οὔτε ἡλλοιωμένη τῆς ἰδίας αἰδιότητος τε καὶ δόξης, ὡς ὁ Ἀρειος κενοφωνῶν ἐδογματίσεν, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἦν ἡ τριάς τριάς καὶ οὐδέποτε ἡ τριάς προσθήκην λαμβάνει, μία οὔσα θεότης μία κυριότης μία οὔσα δοξολογία, ἀλλὰ τριάς ἀριθμουμένη, πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐν τι τρισὶν ὀνόμασι κεκλημένον, ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς τέλειαι τὰ ὀνόματα, τέλειαι αἱ ὑποστάσεις· οὐδὲν δὲ παρηλλαγμένον, πατὴρ δὲ αἰὲν πατὴρ καὶ οὐκ ἦν καιρὸς ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ πατὴρ, τέλειος ὢν αἰὲν πατὴρ ἐνυπόστατος καὶ υἱὸς αἰὲν τέλειος ὢν, αἰὲν ἐνυπόστατος, ἐκ πατρὸς ἐν ἀληθείᾳ γεγεννημένος ... For similar trinitarian expositions using our term cf. *Ancoratus* 6,5f. (GCS 25, 12); 67,4 (ibid. 81f.); 81,1–5 (ibid., 101f.); *Panarion* 62,6f. (GCS 31, 394–396); 76,18 (GCS 37, 364).

¹⁰² Ibid. 65,3 (GCS 37, 5f.): εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ οὐ κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν μόνον ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν. καὶ εἰ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, οὐχ ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶ πρὸς ὃν ἦν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πρὸς ὃν ἦν ἐστὶ λόγος. εἰ γὰρ ἐν καρδίᾳ λόγον θεὸς ἔχει, * καὶ οὐ γεγεννημένον, πῶς πληροῦται τὸ ἦν καὶ ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος; οὐ γὰρ ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λόγος ἀνθρώπος πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπον· οὔτε γὰρ ζῇ οὔτε ὑπέστη, καρδίας δὲ ζωῆς καὶ ὑφ'εστῶσης κίνημά ἐστι μόνον καὶ οὐχ ὑπόστασις. λέγεται γὰρ ἄμα καὶ παραχρῆμα οὐκέτι ἐστίν.

¹⁰³ Cf. ab. nn. 45f.

¹⁰⁴ *Panarion* 71,5 (GCS 37, 254); cf. esp. 71,2 (Ibid. 251: ὁ λόγος ἐν τῷ πατρί, φησὶν, ἦν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν υἱός); 71,3f. (Ibid. 252f.: neither λόγος ἐνδιάθετος nor προφορικός).

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. 71,3 (Ibid., 252) cf. Eusebius, *De ecclesiastica theologia* 11,16 (GCS 14, 120): τί δὲ μὴ πιστεύωμ ἐἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ προσποιεῖται πιστεύειν, σχηματιζόμενος διὰ τοῦ τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐν τῷ θεῷ υἱὸν ἀποκαλεῖν, σαφῶς τοῦ παραδείγματος μακρῶ διεστάναι διδάσκοντος τὸν ἔμφυτον ἐν ψυχῇ λόγον παρὰ τὸν ἐκ τίνος γεννηθέντα καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑφ'εστῶτα καὶ ζῶντα καὶ ἐνεργοῦντα υἱόν;

2.2.3. *John Chrysostom*

John Chrysostom also explicitly maintains against every kind of modalistic heresy that the Logos is not a mere ἐνέργεια of God, but an οὐσία ἐνυπόστατος.¹⁰⁶ In his homily on Hbr 1:3 he draws from the title *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως* a conclusion exactly opposite to the one the Anhomoean drew in the pseudo-Athanasian dialogue: the impress of a hypostasis does not have its being in this hypostasis, but exists independently outside it and resembles it in every respect. The terms ἀπαύγασμα and *χαρακτήρ* entail a perfect similarity of Father and Son which must also include the substantial reality of the Father: “Just as the Father is ἐνυπόστατος without lacking anything for being a hypostasis, such is the Son also”.¹⁰⁷ This relation of perfect similarity is, however, inconceivable without a diversity of the two relata, which is for Chrysostom marked by the term *χαρακτήρ*: the diversity of two substantially equal, yet (on the grounds of their characteristic properties) perfectly distinguishable hypostases.¹⁰⁸

Yet, Chrysostom’s most significant contribution seems to be a first explicit link of our term with the philosophical substance-accident scheme. Quoting the heretics’ objection that an ἀπαύγασμα is not ἐνυπόστατον, “but has its being in something else”,¹⁰⁹ he clearly has in mind the Aristotelian

¹⁰⁶ Homily 6 in Phil 2:5–8 (MSG 62, 219B: Μάρκελλος δὲ καὶ Φωτεινὸς καὶ Σωφρόνιος τὸν Λόγον ἐνέργειαν εἶναι φασί, τὴν δὲ ἐνέργειαν ταύτην ἐνοικῆσαι τῷ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ, οὐκ οὐσίαν ἐνυπόστατον); cf. Homily 4 in John 1:1 (MSG 59, 47B: οὗτος δὲ ὁ Λόγος οὐσία τίς ἐστιν ἐνυπόστατος, ἐξ αὐτοῦ προεληθούσα ἀπαθῶς τοῦ Πατρὸς).

¹⁰⁷ Homily 2 on Hbr 1:3 (MSG 63, 20B): τί δὲ φησι; Καὶ *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως* αὐτοῦ· δηλῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπαγωγῆς, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατὴρ ἐνυπόστατος, καὶ πρὸς ὑπόστασιν οὐθενὸς δεόμενος· οὕτω καὶ ὁ Υἱός. Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον δεικνύς τοῦτο φησι, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἰδιαίχοντα *χαρακτήρα* τοῦ πρωτοτύπου παραπέμπων σε, καὶ διδάσκων ὡς ἐν ὑποστάσει ἐστὶ καὶ ἑαυτὸν. Cf. the similar argument in Rufinus of Aquileia, *Expositio symboli* 7 (CCL 20, 143 f.): “sed fortasse dicas quia ista, quam memoras, insubstantiua est generatio: neque enim lux substantium profert splendorem, aut cor substantium generat uerbum: filius autem dei substantialiter adseritur generatus. [...] Tum etiam illud addimus, quia omnis creatura ex nihilo est. Si ergo insubstantiua sit illa quae gignit ex sese creatura, quae ex nihilo facta est, conditionem in hoc seruat originis suae: illius autem aeternae lucis substantia, quae semper fuit, quia insubstantium in se nihil habuit, insubstantium ex se splendorem proferre non potuit.”

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. (63, 22B): Ὁ γὰρ *χαρακτήρ* ἄλλος τίς ἐστι παρὰ τὸ πρωτότυπον· ἄλλος δὲ οὐ πάντη, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον εἶναι· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὁ *χαρακτήρ* τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον δηλοῖ οὐ ἐστὶ *χαρακτήρ*, τὸ ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα. The best translation of κατὰ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον εἶναι would here be something like “as to their hypostatical diversity”.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid. (63, 20B): ἐπειδὴ εἰσὶ τινες ἄτοπα τινα ἐκ τοῦ ὑποδείγματος ἐκλαμβάνοντες. Τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα, φασίν, ἐνυπόστατον οὐκ ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἐτέρῳ ἔχει τὸ εἶναι. Μὴ τοῦτο τοίνυν ἐκλάβῃς, ἄνθρωπε, μηδὲ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Φωτεινοῦ νοσήσης τὴν νόσον.

distinction between things that are in something else as their subject and other things that are subjects themselves.¹¹⁰

2.2.4. Cyril of Alexandria

Cyril of Alexandria is again really fond of our term: It occurs 51 times in his works, only once in a non-trinitarian context.¹¹¹ He is probably the author presenting the richest variety of hypostasis- and ousia-language, mainly in his two big treatises on the trinity and his commentary on John. He likes to combine ἐνυπόστατος not only with terms like ἐνούσιος or οὐσιώδης, but especially with the more 'lively' ζῶν and sometimes also ἐνεργής.¹¹² His trinitarian theology seems all in all less defensive and less concerned about possible misunderstandings than that of his predecessors: He freely develops a positive understanding of the hypostasis of the Son as word, power and wisdom of God. In his *De recta fide ad Theodosium* he mentions the modalistic word-concept only within the refutation of an adoptianist Christology à la Paul of Samosata or Photinus:

Some people deface the beauty of truth [...] and imagine the Only-begotten inexistent and not subsisting independently (ἰδικῶς οὐχ ὑφ'εστῆκότα). Those miserable people are claiming that he is not endowed with an independent hypostasis (οὐκ εἶναι μὲν ἐν ὑποστάσει τῇ καθ' ἑαυτόν), but that he is simply a word, the speech happening merely according to God's utterance and inhabiting a man. Having composed Jesus this way, they say that he is holier than the saints, but by no means God. [...] However, the likenesses are like their archetypes. They have to be just like them and no different. Thus, if neither the likeness is ἐνυπόστατος nor the image is perceived as endowed with independent existence (ἐν ὑπάρξει νοοῖτο τῇ καθ' ἑαυτόν), they will have to admit as a necessary consequence that also the one to whom the image corresponds is ἀνυπόστατος, and the stain of the likeness will most certainly be carried over to the archetype.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Cf. bel. nn. 201–211.

¹¹¹ *In Isaiam* on 1:19 f. (MSG 70, 48C: Εἰ γὰρ φύσει τὸ κακὸν, καὶ ἐνυπόστατόν ἐστιν ...). Cf. ab. n. 59.

¹¹² 19 times combined with ζῶν: *Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate* (MSG 75, 80C.596B); *In Joannem* (ed. Pusey, vol. I, 35.294.382; vol. II, 47.310.697.714); *De st. Trinitate dialogi* (ed. ed. G.M. de Durand, vol. 3, Paris 1978 [SC 246], 92.96.102); *Expositio in Psalmos* (MSG 69, 785A.876A); *Commentarii in Lucam* (ex cat.) (MSG 72, 476A); *Contra Iulianum imperatorem* 1,28 (ed. Burguière and Éviéux, vol. 1, Paris 1985 [SC 322], 160); *De incarnatione unigeniti* (ACO I/1/5,4: ἐνυπόστατος, ἐνεργής, ζῶν); *Epistula ad Maximianum* (ACO I/1/3,72); *Epistula ad monachos* (ACO I/1/1,15)—three times with οὐσιώδης: *Thesaurus* (MSG 75, 580A); *In Joannem* (ed. Pusey I, 70; II, 714)—twice with ἐνούσιος: *Thesaurus* (MSG 75, 104A); *Apolo-gia XII capitulorum contra orientales* (ACO I/1/7,51).

¹¹³ ACO I/1/1, 50f.: Παρασημαίνουσι γὰρ τινὲς τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ κάλλος, καθάπερ τι νόμισμα

Yet, the comparison between the reasoning in the mind afterwards revealed by uttering the word and the begetting of the Logos is keenly drawn upon elsewhere.¹¹⁴ The phenomena of word, reason and wisdom can illustrate the simultaneity of unity of essence and distinction of persons beautifully, because word and wisdom are “from and within the intellect immediately and without expansion”, and all three have, as it were, an “interpenetration in one another”: “For the intellect is in word and wisdom, and the word will appear in turn in the intellect, and nothing interrupts or separates one from the other”.¹¹⁵

In his *Thesaurus*, Cyril answers the heretic's objection how a momentarily uttered word can be the eternal Son of God in the following way:

The word coming from a man is resolved into nothing and is neither alive nor active, as also the man who ‘begot’ it comes from nothing and is subject to destruction. In contrast, the Logos of God is living; as it comes from some living thing, it was always existing and exists (always). For neither was God ever nor will he ever be without the Logos.¹¹⁶

Yet, even more important for him than ‘word’ and ‘wisdom’ seems to be the title ‘power of God’. The title δύναμις (ζῶσα καὶ) ἐνυπόστατος¹¹⁷ for the Son

κιβδηλεύοντες ἐπαίροντές τε εἰς ὕψος τὸ κέρασ καὶ ἀδικίαν λαλοῦντες κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον ἀνυπαρκτόν τε καὶ ἰδικῶς οὐχ ὑφεστηκότα φαντάζονται τὸν μονογενῆ, καὶ οὐκ εἶναι μὲν ἐν ὑποστάσει τῇ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν, ῥήμα δὲ ἀπλῶς καὶ λόγον τὸν κατὰ μόνην τὴν προφορὰν γενέσθαι παρὰ θεοῦ καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ κατοικήσαι φασιν οἱ τάλανες. συνθέντες δὲ οὕτως τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀγίων μὲν εἶναι φασιν ἀγιώτερον, οὐ μὴν ἔτι καὶ θεόν. [...] αἱ δὲ εἰκόνες ὡς τὰ ἀρχέτυπα· δεῖ γὰρ οὕτως αὐτάς καὶ οὐχ ἑτεροίως ἔχειν. οὐκοῦν εἰ μὴ ἐνυπόστατος ἡ εἰκὼν μήτε μὴν ἐν ὑπάρξει νοοῖτο τῇ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ὁ χαρακτήρ, ἀνυπόστατον εἶναι θάσουςιν ὡς ἐξ ἀναγκάου λόγου καὶ τὸν οὐπὲρ ἐστὶ χαρακτήρ, καὶ τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος ἀκαλλῆς ἀναδραμεῖται που πάντως ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον. Note the parallel terms and phrases for our term highlighted in the first two and fourth brackets.

¹¹⁴ Cf. *Thesaurus* (MSG 75, 80C.297B.321D–324A); *In Ioannem* (ed. Pusey, vol. I, 69f.; vol. II, 310). In another passage of the commentary on John (ibid. vol. I, 57) the Arians postulating a λόγος ἐνδιάθετος in the Father, which is responsible for the existence of the Son, are asked whether they consider this logos to be ἀν- or ἐνυπόστατον. If it subsisted properly, there would be two sons. If it did not, nothing can disturb the continuity between Father and Son.

¹¹⁵ *In Ioannem* 1:3 (ed. Pusey, vol. I, 70).

¹¹⁶ *Thesaurus* 16 [on the eternity of the Son] (MSG 75, 300A). A similar argument of Eunomius that a ῥήματος ἀργὴ προφορὰ and an ἐπιστήμη ἀνυπόστατος cannot be the Son of God is refuted the very same way later on (Ibid., 321C–324B). Cf. also his positive evaluation of the craftsman/know-how-analogy in his *Expositio in Psalmos* on Ps. 33:9 (MSG 69, 876B): Τὸ δὲ ἐνετειλατο μὴ νομίσης ἀνθρωποπρεπῶς, ἐννόει δὲ μᾶλλον ὅτι καὶ τῶν βανασικῶν τεχνῶν οἱ ἐπιστήμονες, ὅταν τι διατεκτήνασθαι βούλωνται τῶν ἐγνωσμένων αὐτοῖς, μονονοῦχι καὶ ἐντέλλονται τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ τέχνῃ διὰ γε τοῦ ἐθέλειν ἐργάσασθαι τι· καὶ ἡ τοῦ νοῦ πρὸς τὰ ἔργα ῥοπή, δύναμιν ἔχει προστάγματος καὶ αὐτοκελεύστου φορᾶς. Ἄλλ’ ἐπὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπων, ἀνυπόστατος αὐτὴ καθ’ ἑαυτήν ἢ τε σοφία καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν· ἐπὶ δὲ Θεοῦ οὐκέτι. Ὑφέστηκε γὰρ ὁ Λόγος δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐργάζεται, διὰ γε, φημί, τῆς ἐνούσης αὐτῷ δυνάμεως καὶ σοφίας.

¹¹⁷ *In Ioannem* (ed. Pusey, vol. I, 70; vol. II, 697.700); *De st. Trinitate dialogi* (SC 246, 92.96);

occurs six times, the title ἐνέργεια ἐνυπόστατος for the Spirit twice.¹¹⁸ Moreover, Cyril presents several ontological reflections about the substantial or accidental status of a power or energy:

Again, [the Son is called] power, because he continuously inheres in those who are apt to possess it and is never separable from them (as he would be, if he were to be classed with accidents) without the destruction of the subject, [...] because each of them is naturally and necessarily in the other. When the Father is active, the Son is obviously also active, like his natural, substantial and ἐνυπόστατος power. Accordingly, when the Son is active, the Father is also active, like the source of the creating Logos, which substantially inheres in its own offspring like the fire in the heat it emits.¹¹⁹

Both the Son and the Spirit are adequately described as a natural power or energy, inseparable from the divine essence, but nevertheless distinguishable from it.¹²⁰ Thus, Cyril conceives a form of in-existence which must not be confused with that of an accident, because the in-existing Son and Spirit cannot be removed without corruption of their subject. He might be well aware of the paradox when he speaks about an ἐνυπόστατος σοφία ἐνυπάρχουσα τῷ θεῷ¹²¹ using a term usually signifying the insubsistence of accidents in its subject in order to describe the son's being in the father (John 10:38),¹²² while his predecessors apparently did not allude to its philosophical use in employing the term ἐνυπάρχειν.

Expositio in Ps 9:33 LXX [10:12a] (MSG 69, 785A: the Son as χεῖρ θεοῦ). Cf. *De st. Trinitate dialogi* (SC 246, 102): ζῶσα καὶ ἐνυπόστατος ἰσχύς and also the spurious *Collectio dictorum in Vetus testamentum* (MSG 77, 1261A: ἰσχύς δὲ καὶ δύναμις ἐνυπόστατος).

¹¹⁸ *Thesaurus* 34 (MSG 75, 580A.596B).

¹¹⁹ *In Ioannem* 1:3 (ed. Pusey, vol. I, 70). On the philosophical discussion of the so-called 'substantial qualities' cf. bel. nn. 261–286.

¹²⁰ Cf. *Thesaurus* 34 (MSG 75, 596B/C): Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἢ θεία γραφή τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πνεῦμα διηγεκῶς ἀποκαλοῦσα φαίνεται, οὐχ ἔν τι τῶν συμβεβηκότων αὐτῷ δηλοῦσα, [...] ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἐστὶ κατὰ φύσιν τοῦτο σημαίνουσα, [...]. Οὐκοῦν εἴπερ ἐστὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔξωθεν ἔχει τὸ εἶναι τοιοῦτο, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸ, τῆς θείας ὑπάρχον οὐσίας ἐνέργεια φυσική τε καὶ ζῶσα καὶ ἐνυπόστατος, προστίθῃσιν αἰεὶ τῇ κτίσει τὸ τέλειον δι' ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸ μετοχής.

¹²¹ *Thesaurus* 19 (MSG 75, 324A) cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 31.32, ed. Gallay, Paris 1978 (SC 250), 338f.: μὴ τὸν πατέρα μὲν οὐσιώσωμεν, τᾶλλα δὲ μὴ ὑποστήσωμεν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεις θεοῦ ποιήσωμεν ἐνυπαρχούσας, οὐχ ὑφεστώσας. On ἐνυπάρχειν as a technical philosophical term for accidental inherence cf. bel. n. 246.

¹²² Cf. *Thesaurus* 8 (MSG 75, 104A: Δέδεικται γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς ἐν οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει πρὸς τὰ ἐν-οὐσία τε καὶ ἐνυπόστατα ἢ ὁμοίους ἢ κατὰ τοῦτο σώζεται, οὐ πρὸς τὰ ἑτερογενῆ, καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις ἔχοντα τὸ εἶναι, ὥσπερ ἢ σοφία τυχὸν ἐν τῷ σοφῷ, καὶ ἢ βούλησις ἐν τῷ βουλευομένῳ.) and esp. *De st. Trinitate dialogi*, ed. G.M. de Durand, vol. 1, Paris 1976 (SC 231), 270 f.: Οὐ γὰρ δὴ διαμεμνήση πεπονηκός τις ἡμῖν τοῦ λόγου καὶ ὡς ἐνὶ καλῶς ἀποδεδειχτός ἐστι τὰ ἐν τάξει τῶν συμβεβηκότων, ἢ καὶ ἐνόντων ἀπλῶς κατηριθμημένα, ἥκιστα μὲν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς, ἑτέροις δὲ μᾶλλον ἐνυπαρχόντα κατα-θρῆσαι τις ἂν, καὶ δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι τι καθ' ἑαυτὰ καὶ λέγεσθαι, φύσιν δὲ τὴν τοῦ λαχόντος ὡς ἰδίαν ἔχει.

To conclude, the technical meaning of ἐνυπόστατος developed during the trinitarian debates of the fourth century is in a way diametrically opposed to its meaning as a Christological term: Whereas it was introduced into trinitarian theology to maintain the independent substantial existence (καθ' ἐαυτὸ ὑφιστάναι) of Son and Spirit,¹²³ its Christological intention was to deny exactly this existence on its own with regard to the human nature of Christ. Before Leontius of Byzantium, something ἐνυπόστατον is necessarily a ὑπόστασις, just like something ἐνούσιον is an οὐσία. Furthermore, all four terms were absolutely convertible, before the differentiation between ὑπόστασις and οὐσία had received general acceptance and application in the works of the Neochalcedonians. To a considerable extent the orthodox antimodalist polemic grew accustomed to the fallacy of calling everything without independent existence an ἀνυπόστατον similar to a chimera or another kind of useless fantasy-product: "For what does not subsist (τὸ γὰρ μὴ ὑφεστῶς) is on one level with nothingness, rather nothing at all"¹²⁴—a mistaken conclusion the Neochalcedonians would have to struggle hard with against the Nestorians and Monophysites.

¹²³ Cf. John of Damascus in his chapter on the trinity (*Expositio* 8, 184; *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. B. Kotter, vol. 2, Berlin 1973 [PTS 12], 26): ἐνυπόστατον ἦτοι ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει ὑπάρχον.

¹²⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *De recta fide ad Theodosium* (ACO I/1/1,50 f.): οὐ γὰρ ἂν τις ἀναμάθοι τί ἐστι πατήρ, εἰ μὴ υἱὸν ὑφεστῶτά τε καὶ γεγεννημένον εἰσδέξαιτο κατὰ νοῦν· ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἂν ὅ τί ποτέ ἐστιν υἱός, ἀναμάθοι πάλιν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι τέτοκεν ὁ πατήρ, διενθυμοίτο σαφῶς οὐκοῦν ἀναγκαῖον οἶμαί που καὶ ἀσφαλές εἰπεῖν ὡς εἴπερ ἐστὶν ἀνυπαρκτός ὁ υἱός, οὐδ' ἂν τὸν πατέρα πατέρα κατὰ τὸ ἀληθὲς νοήσαιμεν ἂν. ποῦ γὰρ ἐστι πατήρ, εἰ μὴ τέτοκεν ἀληθῶς; ἢ εἴπερ γεγέννηκε τὸ μὴ ὑφεστῶς μηδὲ ὑπάρχον ὅλως, τὸ γεννηθὲν ἔσται τὸ μηδέν. τὸ γάρτοι μὴ ὑφεστῶς ἐν ἴσῳ τῷ μηδενί, μᾶλλον δὲ παντελῶς οὐδέν. εἴτα τοῦ μηδενός ἔσται πατήρ ὁ θεός; For the philosophical background of this ontological claim Cf. bel. nn. 159 f.

PART II

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL APPLICATION OF ΕΝΥΠΙΟΣΤΑΤΟΣ

INTRODUCTION

Having examined the rise of the term ἐνυπόστατος in Christian, especially trinitarian theology, we will now turn to the Neochalcedonian Christology and its use of the term in question. The debate around this term initiated by F. Loofs' important study 'Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche' is not mainly concerned with the historical problem of determining the semantics of a special technical term in several authors of a certain period. The more recent discussion did, as already pointed out in the general introduction, not only take into account the theology of Karl Barth which was attacked by F. LeRon Shults for relying on Loofs' incorrect representation of Leontius' so-called doctrine of enhypostasia,¹²⁵ but also determined the link between Barth and the possibly misrepresented Leontius: the confessional orthodoxy of the 17th century.¹²⁶ Let us quote one of the standard explanations of the term from this era:

ἀνυπόστατον is what does not subsist per se and according to a proper personality; ἐνυπόστατον is what subsists in another entity and has become participant of another hypostasis. If the human nature of Christ is therefore said to be ἀνυπόστατος, this merely expresses the fact that it does not subsist for itself in a proper personality; but it is called ἐνυπόστατος, because it has become participant of an alien hypostasis and subsists in the Logos.¹²⁷

As Loofs puts it:

Factisch ist das ἐνυπόστατον εἶναι bei Zusammensetzungen ein prädicatives Sein von sonst selbständigen φύσεις oder οὐσίαι. Sonst selbständige φύσεις nehmen eine Stellung ein ähnlich der ποιότητες οὐσιώδεις und ἐπουσιώδεις.

¹²⁵ "A dubious Christological formula: From Leontius of Byzantium to Karl Barth", in: *Theological Studies* 57 (1996) 431–446. The article was subsequently discussed by D.M. Ferrara, "Hypostatized in the Logos. Leontius of Byzantium, Leontius of Jerusalem and the unfinished business of the council of Chalcedon", in: *Louvain Studies* 22 (1997), 311–327; U.M. Lang, "Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos: Church Fathers, Protestant Orthodoxy and Karl Barth", in: *JThS* 49 (1998), 630–657 and M. Gockel, "Christological formula".

¹²⁶ Cf. Lang, "Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos", 655 f. and ab. nn. 11–15.

¹²⁷ J.A. Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica sive Systema theologicum* (1685), in: Schmid, *Dogmatik*, 217 n. 6a. For I.A. Dorner as a second important source for the Loofsian reading cf. J. Lebon, "La christologie du monophysisme syrien", in: A. Grillmeier/H. Bacht (eds.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Vol I: *Der Glaube von Chalkedon*, Würzburg 1951, (425–580) 516–519.

[...] Sein [Leontius'] Begriff der φύσις oder οὐσία ist der der aristotelischen δευτέρα οὐσία, dem aristotelischen der πρώτη οὐσία entspricht der Begriff der ὑπόστασις. Gleichwie bei Aristoteles das Genus und die διαφοραί, welche die δευτέρα οὐσία constituieren, individualisiert werden durch das εἶναι ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ, so wird bei unserem Verfasser die menschliche Natur in Christo individualisiert durch das εἶναι ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει τοῦ λόγου, durch das ὑποστῆναι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ.¹²⁸

As we have seen during our examination of the trinitarian context, this can hardly represent the common meaning this term had in the Christological discussion of the early sixth century. This is probably why B. Daley used our term as a starting-point for his attack on the systematic implications of Loofs' interpretation, which had both integrated Leontius into the Cyrillian tradition (i.e. the Neochalcedonian Insubistence-Christology) and had proclaimed him as an extraordinarily innovative thinker, especially with regard to his concept of personality¹²⁹—a point which was elaborated further by S. Otto¹³⁰ and afterwards also extended to other fields of metaphysics.¹³¹ We will thus have to deal with the development of our term taking into account at least three levels: The usage of the term itself, the usage of phrases like ὑποστῆναι ἐν λόγῳ and their meaning in the context of the different authors' Christology, and the possible connection between our term and those phrases. Although there is a various number of expressions for insubistence occurring in our texts, we will for the sake of convenience subsume every phrase describing the relationship between Christ's natures, especially his human nature, and his hypostasis, the divine Logos, as in-being, in-existing, being perceived in etc. under the title 'insubistence formula' being fully aware of the fact that the wording of this 'formula' may display considerable differences. Besides, speaking of an 'insubistence formula' rather than of a mere 'insubistence language' may seem justified,

¹²⁸ "Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche", in: TU 3 (1888), (1–317) 68.

¹²⁹ Cf. Daley's surveys of the discussion in "The Christology of Leontius of Byzantium: Personalism or Dialectics?", Oxford 1979 (ms), 2–13 and "A Richer Union: Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ", in: *Studia Patristica* 24, Leuven 1993, (239–265) 240–244.

¹³⁰ *Person und Subsistenz. Die philosophische Anthropologie des Leontius von Byzanz*, Munich 1968.

¹³¹ Cf. e.g. H. Stickelberger, "Substanz und Akzidens bei Leontius von Byzanz. Die Veränderung eines philosophischen Denkmodells durch die Christologie", in: ThZ 36 (1980), 153–161. I could not see N.J. Moutafakis, "Christology and its philosophical complexities in the thought of Leontius of Byzantium", in: *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 10 (1993), 99–119.

because the introduction of this 'formula' into the Christological debate is, as will be shown below, most probably due to one single locus classicus quoted by almost all the Neochalcedonian authors who developed an insub-sistence Christology: the pseudo-Athanasian letter to Jovianus.¹³²

¹³² Cf. *bel. n.* 164.

CHAPTER THREE

ENYTIOTATOS, THE 'INSUBSISTENCE FORMULA', THEIR CONNECTION AND RELEVANCE FOR POST-CHALCEDONIAN CHRISTOLOGY DURING THE SIXTH-CENTURY DEBATE

The systematic problem motivating both the introduction of the insubistence formula and the transformation of ἐνυπόστατος into a technical term of Christology is already formulated by Cyril of Alexandria in his second letter to Succensus:

If one and the same is conceived as complete God and complete man, consubstantial with the Father according to his godhead, but according to his manhood consubstantial with us, where is this completeness, if the human nature did not subsist (ὑφέστηκεν)?¹³³

Interestingly enough, the very first discussion of this question employing our term took place before the Neochalcedonian period, even before Cyril's letter was written. As it links up with the trinitarian debate of the term much more clearly than John the Grammarian's apology for Chalcedon, but contributes hardly anything to the further Christological developments, we will just mention it very briefly before entering the examination of the post-Chalcedonian contexts. In the fictional correspondence between Dionysius of Alexandria and Paul of Samosata—ascribed by E. Schwartz to an Apollinarian author of the early fifth century attacking Theodore of Mopsuestia¹³⁴—the adoptianist heretic Paul is criticized by the orthodox for claiming the “form of a servant” the Logos assumed (Phil 2:7) to be ἐνυπόστατος, thus introducing two ἐνυπόστατα into Christ's person and destroying the unity of his hypostasis.¹³⁵ In case of a human being, things

¹³³ ACO I/1/6, 160,14–16.

¹³⁴ “Fingierte Korrespondenz”, 55–58. The redating into the sixth century recently suggested by M. Simonetti (“Sulla corrispondenza tra Dionigi di Alessandria e Paolo di Samosata”, in: *Augustinianum* 47 [2007], 321–334) rests in my opinion on rather weak arguments, although we admittedly know neither the different currents of Apollinarism nor the radically monophysite ones well enough to be absolutely sure in the attribution. That a radical monophysite of the sixth century should, however, completely refrain from any polemics against Chalcedon whatsoever seems, in my opinion, much less probable than an Apollinarist's silence regarding the sophisticated peculiarities of his master's teaching.

¹³⁵ This is the topic of protasis 7 (Schwartz, “Fingierte Korrespondenz”, 26–33; cf.

like form, logos or wisdom are ἀνυπόστατα, whereas they are ἐνυπόστατα in God.¹³⁶ Christ's transfiguration (μεταμόρφωσις) shows that his human μορφή can never have been ἐνυπόστατος, if one wants to avoid the absurdity of three μορφαὶ ἐνυπόστατοι, the divine one, the human one and the glorified one.¹³⁷ Thus, Christ's human form is by no means a δοῦλος ἐνυπόστατος inhabited by the Logos, but only a transitory state during the exination of the Logos.¹³⁸ What this Apollinarian author wants to provide is an application of the antimodalist polemics and its terminology to Christology: Just as it is wrong to conceive of form, word and wisdom of God as ἀνυπόστατον and not existing by itself as the second hypostasis of the trinity, one must not hypostasize God's human actions and make a δοῦλος ἐνυπόστατος of the deeds the Logos accomplished in human form in order to serve mankind. What he achieved is a fairly clear deviation into docetism. Let us see whether—despite the aforementioned Apollinarian objection—the post-Chalcedonian authors are able to bestow upon Christ's human nature a proper subsistence without dissolving the unity of his person.

3.1. JOHN THE GRAMMARIAN AND THE INTRODUCTION OF ΕΝΥΠΙΟΙΣΤΑΤΟΣ INTO THE CHRISTOLOGICAL DEBATE

3.1.1. ἐνυπόστατος and Insubsistence in John's Apology for Chalcedon

John the Grammarian of Cesarea is commonly credited with having not only introduced our term into the Christological debate but also with having applied the Cappadocian trinitarian terminology to Chalcedonian Christology, mainly in an apology he wrote for the fourth council at about

Schwartz's summary on 51 f.), but it is already envisaged in Dionysius' letter (ibid. 5; 209,5–6 Turrianus) and also touched in prot. 2 (p. 11; 221,13–222,8). This discussion could be reflected in Cyril's apology of his first anathematism against Theodoretus (ACO I/1/6, 112,12–113,25), where Cyril asks whether the incarnation was a unification of two proper realities or just of ὁμοίότητες ἀνυπόστατοι or μορφαί, and whether Theodoretus wants to postulate a συνάφεια σχετική δουλοπρεπούς καὶ ἀνυποστάτου μορφῆς πρὸς ἀνυπόστατον καὶ θεῖαν μορφήν. A varia lectio already testified by Euboulos of Lystra in the seventh century (apud *Doctrinam patrum de incarnatione verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*, ed. E. Chrysos, Münster 1981, 142,24 f.) reads πρὸς ἐνυπόστατον καὶ θεῖαν μορφήν the possible authenticity of which would make Cyril's acquaintance with our Apollinarian author almost certain.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 5 (209,3–9). Cf. the opposite line of argument in Epiphanius ab. n. 61.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 27 f. (251,5–252,7).

¹³⁸ Ibid., 11 (222,5–8). 26 (249,10–14). 31 (259,11–15). 34 (264,13–265,2).

514–518.¹³⁹ Some Greek fragments of this apology are preserved in Eulogius of Alexandria's *Συνηγορίαι*, which is itself only extant in fragments contained in the *Doctrina patrum*.¹⁴⁰ The most important source for the theology of our Grammarian and its systematic relevance is Severus of Antioch's polemical opus magnum *Contra impium grammaticum*, which survives in syriac translation.

According to these sources, John seems to have used our term in three different contexts:

- (1) His use of the phrase ἐνυπόστατον πρόσωπον is an obvious resumption of the traditional trinitarian usage.¹⁴¹ According to the typical Neochalcedonian identification of the second hypostasis of the Trinity with the unique hypostasis of the incarnate Christ proclaimed in Chalcedon,¹⁴²

¹³⁹ Cf. S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus. Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffs*, Dissertation Bonn 1962, 160–162 (on person and works) and A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Vol. II/2: *Die Kirche von Konstantinopel im 6. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg a.e. 1989, 56–69 (on his terminological innovations). Some tendencies towards the application of Cappadocian terminology to Christology can already be found in Theodoretus of Cyrus (cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* I, 694–698). The first explicit identification of the second hypostasis of trinity with the unique hypostasis postulated by Chalcedon is possibly to be found in the small fragment against the Nestorians attributed to Gennadius of Constantinople (J. Declerck, "Le patriarche Gennade de Constantinople [458–471] et un opuscule inedit contre les Nestoriens", in: *Byzantion* 60 [1990], [130–144] 138): "Ἀλλωστε καὶ ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν ἢ σὰρξ οὐκ ἔσχεν, ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου ἦν ὑπόστασις διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀνθρωποτόκον ἀλλὰ θεοτόκον καλοῦμεν. Ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου ὑπόστασις ἐγένετο τῇ σαρκί, οὐχὶ ἀνθρωπότης τῆς θεότητος. Ὡσπερ τῷ τῆς ὑποστάσεως λόγῳ σταυρωθέντα τὸν θεὸν λέγομεν καὶ παθεῖν, οὕτω καὶ γεννηθῆναι τὸν θεὸν Λόγον. [...] Ὑμεῖς δὲ [...] χριστοτόκον λέγοντες ὀνόματι μόνον λέγετε θεόν, πράγματι δὲ προὔποστῆναι τὴν ὑπόστασιν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, καὶ οὕτως ἐνοικῆσαι ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν θεόν. Considering the fact how little we know about Gennadius as a writer and theologian and how short the piece is, it is, however, rather difficult to be sure about its authenticity.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. *Iohannis Caesariensis presbyteri et grammatici opera quae supersunt*, ed. M. Richard, Turnhout 1977 (CCG 1), V–XXVIII. Richard (pp. XVII–XXV) has shown that Eulogius did not draw upon a Greek copy of Severus, but on the text of the Grammarian's apology itself.

¹⁴¹ CCG 1, 11,166; 52,97. cf. Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72,12; GCS 37,266,4 / Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Testimonia adv. Judaeos*; MSG 46,196C. In the sixth century, the trinitarian use will be prominent esp. in Ps-Caesarius, whose quaestiones offer 10 instances for it (Cf. *Pseudo-Kaisarios. Die Erotapokriseis*, ed. R. Riedinger, Berlin 1989, index s.v.). It also occurs in the scholia on Ps-Denys' *Divine Names* (216,37 and 237,47; ed. B.R. Suchla, Berlin/Boston 2011 [PTS 62], 171,203), where a more 'philosophical' usage, however, seems to be predominant: *In DN* 204,37–39 (PTS 62, 209f.: ἐνέργειαι ἐκεῖ ἐνυπόστατοι εἰσι καὶ οὐσίαι, πᾶσα γὰρ κίνησις καὶ ἡρεμία ἐκεῖ μέντοι ἐνυπόστατοι εἰσιν, καὶ δυνάμεις ζῶσαι); 332,32–34 (ibid., 343: ἐπειδὴ τινες τὰς ἰδέας καὶ τὰ παραδείγματα ἐνυπόστατα ἔφησαν, τοὺτους ἐπιρραπίζει νῦν). For *In DN* 304,40 f. (ibid., 307: πῶς οὖν ἐνυπόστατόν ἐστι τὸ κακόν; cf. ab. n. 59).

¹⁴² Cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 68.

the latter obviously has to be just as hypostatically real and independent as the former.

- (2) He uses it to describe the unity of the two natures in Christ itself, either in the form of an adjective (ἐνωσις ἐνυπόστατος)¹⁴³ or an adverb (ἐνυποστάτως ἐνοῦσθαι).¹⁴⁴
- (3) He employs it to signify the ontological status the two natures in Christ have in being 'real', but nevertheless not self-subsisting, i.e. not having countable hypostases of their own.¹⁴⁵

In evaluating the Syriac fragments Richard presents in the Latin version of J. Lebon, we have equated "hypostaticus" (for Syriac *qnōmathnaya*, *qnōma'īth*) and ἐνυπόστατος not only because of the Grammarian's predilection for our term (possible equivalents like ὑποστατικός are missing), but also because this is proven by Richard's 13th Syriac excerpt, which is part of a longer passage preserved in the Greek original by Eulogius.¹⁴⁶ In *Contra impium grammaticum* II,17, Severus even makes an interesting remark concerning John's use of our term: Facing John's complaint that the Monophysites constantly ignore the Chalcedonian confession of a true, hypostatic union of the two natures, he promises his undiminished attention to every element of the self-contradictory formula of two general substances united καθ' ὑπόστασιν (*be-qnōmā*) or ἐνυποστάτως (*qnōma'īth*), yet attaches to the final clause: "in order to use also this word of yours" (*meṭul de-'afbe-hadā be-melthā dīlak nethḥashaḥ*).¹⁴⁷ If Severus calls ἐνυποστάτως the Grammarian's word (*hadā melthā dīlak*: "this word which belongs to you") and contrasts it to his own (and Cyril's) καθ' ὑπόστασιν (*be-qnōmā*), the former must have

¹⁴³ CCG 1, 10,118; 20,408.410; 52,108; 55,182; 57,256. Also in the *Capitula ctr Monophysitas*: *ibid.* 64,109.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 8,69 (= 53,118); 20,417; 53,133. And the *Capitula*: 61,25; 63,66; 64,122.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 55,201.206.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 53,118 = CSCO 111, 150,30 f. The *Thesaurus Syriacus* of R. Payne-Smith (Vol. II, Oxford 1901, 3669) adduces references in which the term renders ἐνυπόστατος only s.v. *qnōmayā*, most of which stem from a considerably later period (Dionysius bar Salibi, Gregorios bar Hebraeus). Cf. however the translation of Theodosius' *Theological discourse*, where the monophysite patriarch has Gregory of Nazianzus call the Spirit a substance "lest someone think it to be an activity without hypostasis or one of the things which happen to the substance, but rather we confess it to be among that which subsists by itself, like a living and hypostatical (*qnōmayā*) force" (*Monophysite texts of the sixth century*, ed. A. v. Roey/P. Allen, Leuven 1994, 162,78–81/234,75–78). The latter phrase is of course a pretty clear resumption of Cyril's usage (cf. *ab. n.* 117).

¹⁴⁷ CSCO 111, 151,16 f. In Lebon's translation the whole sentence reads (CSCO 112, 118,7–11): "Namque dualitatem naturarum, quae unum Christum in duo secat, evehis ad substantias secundum communem significationem *intellectas*, dicisque illas unitas esse secundum hypostasim, seu, ut hac etiam voce tua utar, hypostaticæ".

sounded fairly unusual to him, which makes it quite improbable that the instances of *qnōmathnaya* or *qnōma'īth* in his own refutation might also, at least partly, render ἐνυπόστατος. As those terms are almost always connected with ἔνωσις or ἐνοῦσθαι, they will most probably stand for καθ' ὑπόστασιν or ὑποστατικός.¹⁴⁸

Thus, there are good reasons to credit the Grammarian with having brought our term into the Christological debate in a twofold manner: both in rephrasing the Cyrilian ἔνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν and, more influentially, in refuting an objection being raised by both Monophysites and Nestorians against the Chalcedonian conception of two natures in one hypostasis: From Timothy Ailuros onwards, the opponents rejected such a possibility, as there can be no nature without hypostasis, or, as John puts it: οὐκ ἔστι φύσις ἀπρόσωπος.¹⁴⁹

This objection is the starting point and central topic of the longest Greek fragment preserved from John's apology (IV,1–6 in CCG 1). The Grammarian reminds his opponents of the Cappadocian distinction between οὐσία,

¹⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. *Philaletes*, ed. R. Hespel, Louvain 1952 (CSCO 133), 135,18.23 f., where all three times the original (3rd letter to Nestorius; ACO I/1/1, 40,25 / *Apologia contra Theodoretum*; ACO I/1/6, 115,12 f.) reads καθ' ὑπόστασιν, and Lebon, "Christologie", 469–472. For ὑποστατικὴ ἔνωσις in later (Neo-)Chalcedonian authors cf. Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. ὑποστατικός (p. 1461) B 2d.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Lebon, "Christologie", 461 f. For further occurrences cf. the apparatus on Pamphilus, *Panhoplion* VII,1–4.9 f., ed. J.H. Declerck, Turnhout 1989 (CCG 19), 173, that on Anastasius Sinaita, *Hodegos* VI,2,16 f., ed. K.-H. Uthemann, Turnhout 1981 (CCG 8), 100 and e.g. the small pieces in *Una raccolta di opuscoli Calcedonensi* (*Ms Sinai Syr. 10*), ed. P. Bettolo, Leuven 1974/79 (CSCO 403/4), 21 f./15 f. and 33 f./24. John Maxentius dedicates an entire antimonophysitic treatise to this objection: *Responsio contra Acephalos qui 'post adunationem' stulte 'unam' profitentur 'in Christo naturam'* (ACO IV/2, 12–14). It may be noted that already Nestorius had launched a similar objection against Cyril's post-union claim that a *divisio vocum* (as mere *distinctio rationis*) does not have to entail a *divisio naturarum*: "Ce n'est pas 'en paroles', mais par des paroles attribuées à deux natures qu'ils font la division au point de vue des essences. Les natures sont divisées; elles le sont par les paroles qui les désignent. Les natures ne sont pas sans hypostases, et ce n'est pas en pensée, sans les hypostases des natures, qu'ils les constituent par paroles dans leur pensée, mais c'est par la considération des natures et des essences comme des essences et des natures, qu'ils établissent les idées et les natures" (*Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, trans. F. Nau, Paris 1910, 284). Cf. also the 'protocoll' of the discussion between Justinian and Paul of Nisibis in A. Guillaumont, "Justinien et l'église de Perse", in: *DOP* 23/24 (1969/70), (41–66) 63 and the pieces from Henanisho and Babai the Great in: *A Nestorian collection of Christological texts: Cambridge University Library ms. oriental 1319*, ed. L. Abramowski, Vol. 2, Cambridge 1972, 101–106 and 123–125. The author of the *De sectis* is thus perhaps not unjustified in his claim that the Monophysites stole this argument from the Nestorians (MSG 86/I, 1244D). For the western discussion of this objection cf. C. Erismann, "Non est natura sine persona. The issue of uninstantiated universals from late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages", in: *Methods and Methodologies: Aristotelian Logic East and West 500–1500*, ed. M. Cameron/J. Marenbon, Leiden 2011, 75–91.

φύσις as universal substance and ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον as particular subsistence marked off from its fellow species-members by several distinguishing characteristics. As one can conclude from the fact that human beings are constituted by an immaterial soul and a material body, the presence of two heterogeneous substances does not entail two countable particular subsistences. As Christ's human nature is individualized by the Logos, the second person of the trinity in which it subsists, it must not be counted as a second hypostasis apart from the Logos:

For his are the divine properties by nature, his are also the human properties because of the hypostatical unity, as his individual flesh did not receive subsistence in anybody else but in himself, as mentioned before. All in having the common properties of the human essence, i.e. being a rationally ensouled flesh, it had its individual ones exclusively in the God-Logos, i.e. being the flesh of the God-Logos and nobody else's. So, how should something which never subsisted on its own be another subsistence (hypostasis)?¹⁵⁰

The counter-objection concerning Athanasius' statement, that οὐσία and ὑπόστασις are perfectly synonymous,¹⁵¹ is answered by the Grammarian in distinguishing between two ways of being ἐνυπόστατος:

Thus, if one calls the two substances ἐνυποστάτους in this sense, i.e. existing (ὑπάρχουσας), we will not deny that either. For the hypostasis does not differ from the substance in that it exists, but in that one of them exists in a common way, i.e. the substance, the hypostasis however in an individual way, when it possesses together with the universal element also an individual one. In this sense we do not call our substance in Christ ἐνυπόστατος, as being a characterized hypostasis on its own and a personal appearance, but insofar as it came into being and exists, as sometimes the hypostasis means the mere fact of existence (τὸ ὑφ'εστῆκεναι), which is substance, as it was shown, when it is deprived of its characteristic properties perceived around the personal appearance.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ Apol. IV, 3, 181–188 (CCG 1, 55): αὐτοῦ μὲν γὰρ τῇ φύσει τὰ θεῖα, αὐτοῦ δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐνυπόστατον ἔνωσιν καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα· οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἐτέρῳ, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ ἰδικὴ αὐτοῦ ὑπέστη σὰρξ, ὡς προεῖρηται. τὸ κοινὸν γὰρ ἔχουσα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης οὐσίας, τουτέστι τὸ εἶναι σὰρξ ἐψυχωμένη ψυχῇ λογικῇ, ἐν μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ ἔσχε τὰ ἰδικά, τουτέστι τὸ εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρου σὰρξ. πῶς οὖν ἑτέρα ὑπόστασις ἢ μηδὲλως καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑποστᾶσα;

¹⁵¹ *Epistula ad Afros* 4,3 (Athanasius Werke II/8, 329; quoted Apol. IV, 5, 197–200): Ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαίνονμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν· ὅπερ Ἱερεμίας ὑπαρξὶν ὀνομάζει λέγων· Καὶ οὐκ ἦκουσαν φωνὴν ὑπάρξεως. Ἡ γὰρ ὑπόστασις καὶ ἡ οὐσία ὑπαρξίς ἐστιν. Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ὑπάρχει. Cf. the commentary of A. v. Stockhausen, *Epistula ad Afros*, Berlin / New York 2002 (PTS 56), 172–175.

¹⁵² Apol. IV, 6, 200–211 (CCG 1, 55 f.): εἰ οὖν τις ἐνυποστάτους κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον εἴποι τὰς οὐσίας, ὅ ἐστιν ὑπάρχουσας, οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς ἀρνηθεῖμεν. ἡ γὰρ ὑπόστασις πρὸς τὴν οὐσίαν τῷ εἶναι μὲν τι οὐ διαφέρει, ἀλλὰ τῷ τὴν μὲν κοινῶς εἶναι, φημί δὴ τὴν οὐσίαν, τὴν δὲ ὑπόστασιν ἰδικῶς,

According to this text, our term could signify either the existence of the natures in general or their self-subsistence, i.e. their being independent, countable hypostases, of which in a Christological context obviously only the first one is acceptable, whereas the second would amount to Nestorian heresy (IV,6). The crucial point is that this distinction is based on the fact that those two meanings are also possible for ὑπόστασις, i.e. that the Grammarian still accepts the equation $x \text{ ἑνυπόστατον} = \text{ὑπόστασις of } x$. Accordingly, he speaks at first of two ἑνυπόστατοι οὐσίαι and focuses on Christ's human nature in a second step, probably because the divine nature or the Logos has to be unquestionably called ὑπόστασις or ἑνυπόστατον in both senses.¹⁵³ This fact is misrepresented in K.H. Uthemann's claim of an enhypostasia-theory in John the Grammarian.¹⁵⁴ His simple distinction between 'having' and 'being a hypostasis' does by no means take into account the philosophical problems concerning this issue (existence is not something like a quality: what has existence necessarily also is (an) existence or existent) and moreover presupposes a distinction between ὑπόστασις and ἑνυπόστατον, which can possibly be found from Leontius of Byzantium onwards, but not yet in the Grammarian.

Nevertheless, the Grammarian's secondary focus on the human nature already points towards the later development which will connect our term with the concept of insubsistence. Already for our Grammarian, the human nature insubsists in and is individualized by the Logos, which were the genuine ideas of the traditional and Loofsian theory, but he does not (yet) directly connect those with our term but with the verbal phrase ὑφίστασθαι ἐν. Because the ἑνυπόστατος ἔνωσις unites two natures in the single hypostasis of the Logos, the human nature of Christ subsists, but only in the Logos which marks it off from its human species-members by the characteristic of being his very own flesh.¹⁵⁵ 'Having the hypostasis in the Logos' thus means for the Grammarian to be constituted as an individual by being an

ὅταν μετὰ τῶν καθόλου καὶ ἰδικόν τι ἔχῃ. οὐ κατὰ τοῦτο οὖν φαμεν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐν Χριστῷ οὐσίαν ἑνυπόστατον εἶναι, οἷον ὑπόστασιν καθ' ἑαυτὴν χαρακτηριστικὴν καὶ πρόσωπον οὖσαν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ὑφέστηκέ τε καὶ ἔστιν. ἐνίτε γὰρ τὸ ὑφέστηκέναι δηλοῖ ἢ ὑπόστασις, ὃ ἐστὶν οὐσία, ὡς ἀποδέδεικται, ὅταν τῶν χαρακτηριστικῶν ἰδιωμάτων καὶ περὶ πρόσωπον θεωρουμένων ἐστέρηται.

¹⁵³ CCG 1, 55, 201.206.

¹⁵⁴ "Definitionen und Paradigmen in der Rezeption des Dogmas von Chalkedon bis in die Zeit Kaiser Justinians", in: *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, ed. J. van Oort/J. Roldanus, Leuven 1998, (54–122), 90–94. Our considerations concerning Cyril and Severus should have shown that it is incorrect to speak—as Uthemann does—of an "enhypostatic union", as ἑνυπόστατος ἔνωσις is nothing but one of many possible equivalents for ἔνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν.

¹⁵⁵ CCG 1, 55, 181–188. Quoted ab. n. 152.

immediate creation of the Logos and having the Logos as the principle of subsistence, an idea to be further elucidated shortly, when we deal with the origin and background of the ‘insubsistence formula’.¹⁵⁶

3.1.2. Background and Possible Sources

When we look for possible sources of the Grammarian’s distinction between a wider and narrower use of hypostasis and of his insubsistence-concept, there are possible candidates both in pagan philosophy and in the Christian tradition. As to the first, we find a distinction between a wider and a narrower use of οὐσία which is common to the Aristotelian commentators: It can either mean the opposite of accident, substance in the sense of self-subsisting subject, or existence in general (ἀπλῶς ὑπαρξίς), which comprises also the accidents.¹⁵⁷ We will find this parallel worked out more clearly in the later discussions of our term. Another possible inspiration could have been the twofold use of ἀνυπόστατος meaning both “unsubstantial, without independent existence” and “non-existent, unreal”.¹⁵⁸ In pagan philosophy, the development of the former meaning out of the latter can easily be shown. Already for Aristotle, the accident is ἐγγὺς τι τοῦ μὴ ὄντος,¹⁵⁹ and Sextus Empiricus explains that the so-called accidents do not have an existence distinct from that of substances and are therefore ἀνυπόστατα.¹⁶⁰ This factual equation of dependent existence and non-existence was also received—as we have seen—by the Fathers, when they argued in favour of a self-subsisting hypostasis of the Logos: God the son cannot be something like human thought, word, wisdom or will, because those are all ἀνυπόστατα, without independent existence, factually non-existent.

However, with regard to the relationship of the different hypostatically independent persons to the divine nature, insubsistence language was already used within the framework of Cappadocian trinitarian theology. The author of *Contra Eunomium* V, for example, explains that the divine substance is not ἀγέννητος in the sense of ἀνούσιος and ἀνυπόστατος, i.e.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. bel. at n. 164–171.

¹⁵⁷ Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 115,5f.; *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 20,26–21,2 / Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 20,9–14; *In Phys.*; CAG XVI, 137,25–27; *De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum*, ed. H. Rabe, Leipzig 1899 (repr. Hildesheim 1963), 181,23–182,7.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. (p. 164) B 3 and 4.

¹⁵⁹ *Metaphysics* VI,2 1026b21 cf. XII,1 1069a21f.

¹⁶⁰ *Adv. Mathematicos* X (*Adv. Physicos* II), 238f., ed. R.G. Bury, Cambridge/Mass. 1960, 326: τὰ δὲ λεγόμενα συμβεβηχέναι ταῖς οὐσίαις, οὐχ ἕτερα ὄντα τῶν οὐσιῶν, ἀνυπόστατά ἐστιν. Cf. Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* I,1,32 (GCS 14, 7): καὶ ἦν οὐχ ὡς ψιλὸς θεοῦ λόγος, ἀνυπόστατος, ἐν καὶ ταῦτὸν ὑπάρχων τῷ θεῷ.

absolutely non-existent. One has to distinguish two kinds of ἀνυπόστατα, that which is also ἀνούσιος, absolute nothingness, and that which is ἐνούσιον, i.e. the ἐνυπάρχουσα οὐσία, the essence inexistent in its instances.¹⁶¹ Moreover, in the first of the pseudo-Athanasian dialogues *De trinitate*, the orthodox refutes the anhomoean's objection, that a unique θεότης would imply a unique hypostasis, by drawing upon the Cappadocian distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, which he illustrates with the example of manhood. When the anhomoean asks back: "Ὁ ἀνθρωπότης οὐχ ὑφέστηκεν;", he gets the answer: "Ναί, ἐν ἀτόμοις θεωρουμένη".¹⁶² Accordingly, also for our Grammarian not only the divine substance ἐνυπάρχει in its three hypostases, but also manhood in every individual man and the human nature of Christ in the hypostasis of the Logos,¹⁶³ but he does not yet clarify the relationship between an entity which is ἀν/ἐνυπόστατος (insubstisting natures) and insubstisting accidents. As will be demonstrated in our philosophical excursus below, phrases like ὑφίστασθαι ἐν, τὸ εἶναι or τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔχειν ἐν or θεωρεῖσθαι ἐν were used more or less synonymously in order to signify any kind of relationship to be distinguished from the καθ' αὐτό of an independent, self-subsisting entity: the one between accidents and substance just like the one between a species and its members. The introduction of the insubstistence-formula into Christology is thus at least perfectly compatible with (if not entailed by) that of the Cappadocian terminology. The direct source of the formula itself can, however, be identified with some certainty as the Ps-Athanasian letter to the emperor Jovianus quoted by the Grammarian himself:

¹⁶¹ MSG 29, 749B: Πάλιν ἀγέννητον ἀνούσιον νοοῦμεν τὸ μηδαμῇ μηδαμῶς ὄν. Εἰπέ τις ἀνούσιον, ὑπόστασιν ἀνείλε καὶ οὐσίας ὑπαρξιν. Ἀνούσιον, καὶ ἀνυπόστατον, τὴν μὴ ὑπάρχουσαν μήτε οὔσαν ὅλως σημαίνει φύσιν. Τὸ δὲ ἐνούσιον καὶ ἀνυπόστατον λέγων τις, τὴν ἐνυπάρχουσαν οὐσίαν ἐδήλωσε. The relevance of this passage for the development of our term was already noticed by P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz. Studien zu seinen Schriften, Quellen und Anschauungen*, Paderborn 1908, 154, although he was mistaken in reading ἐνυπόστατον instead of ἀνυπόστατον. The attribution of *Contra Eunomium* IV–V to Didymus of Alexandria is still a matter of dispute (cf. CPG 2837a; suppl. 101).

¹⁶² MSG 28, 1141D. Cf. also Basil (?), *Ep.* 38,3,6–8; ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, Paris 1957, 82: Ὁ δὲ Παῦλον εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν ἐν τῷ δηλουμένῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος πράγματι ὑφεστῶσαν τὴν φύσιν. The Basilian authorship was defended by V.H. Drecoll, *Zur Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilios von Cäsarea. Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*, Göttingen 1996, 297–331, whereas J. Zachhuber, "Nochmals: Der 38. Brief des Basilios von Caesarea als Werk des Gregor v. Nyssa", in: ZAC 7 (2003), 73–90 presents a pretty strong case for attributing it to Gregory.

¹⁶³ CCG 1, 50,52–54; 51,61–67 (*Apologia*); 63,82–102 (*Capitula*). For pagan parallels cf. Asclepius, *In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 431,7 f. / Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 90,8–10 and bel. nn. 199 f.

The Son is still one, also after the assumption, by the dispensation of the unification (τῇ τῆς ἐνώσεως οἰκονομίᾳ). For simultaneous is the flesh, simultaneous God the Word's flesh, simultaneous the logically ensouled flesh, simultaneous God the Word's logically ensouled flesh: ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ καὶ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔσχεν.¹⁶⁴

In order to understand this statement, we ought to have a look at the document of which this confessorial letter has been established to be something like an excerpt: the fourth pseudo-Athanasian dialogue *De trinitate*,¹⁶⁵ where the very same threefold ἄμα serves as a reply to the Apollinarian objection that a human mind in Christ would have to be changeable and therefore subject to sin:

Apol.: If he had been able to sin, he would be changeable. Orth.: Remember the things stated before, for I said: 'If he had not been united, yes'. Without unification Jesus Christ is not conceived of as Christ Jesus, but as God-Logos, true (ἐνυπόστατος) Son of God. If you could find the ensouled body without the unification, then think of change. Yet, if the body is simultaneous, simultaneously both body of the God-Logos and rationally ensouled, simultaneously rationally ensouled body of the God-Logos, what do you look for change?!¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁴ The Greek text: Bizer, *Studien*, 300,14–301,17 (εἰς πάλιν ἐστὶν υἱὸς μετὰ καὶ τῆς προσλήψεως τῇ τῆς ἐνώσεως οἰκονομίᾳ. ἄμα γὰρ σὰρξ, ἄμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ καὶ ἄμα ἔμψυχος λογική, ἄμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ ἔμψυχος λογική· ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ καὶ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔσχεν), partly quoted in CCG 1 13,212–215. For the widespread use of this quotation among (Monophysites and) Neochalcedonians cf. the apparatus on Pamphilus, *Panhoplion* III, 42f. (CCG 19, 145) and Anastasius Sinaita, *Hodegos* II, 5,13f. (CCG 8, 51). An astonishing parallel can be found in Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum* 15,7, ed. H.J. Sieben, Freiburg e.a. 2001 (FC 34), 300: οὕτε γὰρ ἄσαρκος καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ Λόγος τέλειος ἦν Υἱός, καίτοι τέλειος, Λόγος ὢν, μονογενής· οὐθ' ἡ σὰρξ καθ' ἑαυτὴν δίχα τοῦ Λόγου ὑποστῆναι ἠδύνατο διὰ τὸ ἐν Λόγῳ τὴν σύστασιν ἔχειν. If we are not dealing with a later Apollinarian interpolation here, this is the first reference for ὑφίστασθαι in a Christological context (cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* I, 236f.). Cf. Philo, *De aeternitate mundi* 92 (ed. R. Arnaldez/J. Pouilloux, Paris 1969, 140): ὁ λύχνος, ἔως μὲν τις ἔλαιον ἄρδει, περιφεγγεστάτην δίδωσι φλόγα, ἐπειδὴν δ' ἐπίσχη, δαπανήσας ὅσον τῆς τροφῆς λείψανον αὐτὴν κατεσβέσθη, μηδὲν μέρος ταμειουσάμενος τῆς φλογός· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ἀλλ' αὐγὴ γίνεται, πάλιν ἀθρόα μεταβάλλει. διὰ τί; ὅτι ὑπόστασιν ἰδίαν οὐκ ἔχει, γεννᾶται δ' ἐκ φλογός, ἥς ὅλως δι' ὧν σβέσειν λαμβανούσης, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν αὐγὴν μὴ κατὰ μέρος ἀλλ' ἀθρόαν ἀναρεῖσθαι. For the denial of a preexisting human nature of Christ cf. also the text of Gennadius (?) quoted n. 139.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Bizer, *Studien*, 302–305.

¹⁶⁶ *Dialogus* IV, 4 (ed. Capone, 76): 'Απολ. Εἰ ἠδύνατο ἁμαρτῆσαι, τρεπτὸς ἦν. 'Ορθ. Μνημόνευε τῶν εἰρημένων, εἶπον γὰρ 'εἰ μὴ ἦνωτο, ναί'. 'Ιησοῦς δὲ Χριστὸς ἄνευ ἐνώσεως οὐ νοεῖται Χριστὸς 'Ιησοῦς, ἀλλὰ θεὸς λόγος, υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐνυπόστατος. εἰ δὴν εὐρεῖν τὸ ἔμψυχον σῶμα ἄνευ ἐνώσεως, ἐννοεῖ τροπήν, εἰ δὲ ἄμα σῶμα, ἄμα θεοῦ λόγου σῶμα καὶ ἄμα ἔμψυχον λογικόν, ἄμα θεοῦ λόγου σῶμα ἔμψυχον λογικόν, τί ζητεῖς τροπήν;

What the anonymous monophysite author of the letter to Jovianus did with this rhetorically rather effective text, was to combine it with the central theologoumena of the entire dialogue and thus to create something like a very condensed summary of it. Unlike the letter to Jovianus, the dialogue is not concerned with defending the *mia physis*-formula, but with an anti-apollinarian conception of the “unity of dispensation” or “dispensation of unification”,¹⁶⁷ which—qua key-category of his source—is also brought into play by the anonymous Monophysite. Against the Apollinarian idea of deification and heavenly manhood, the dialogue upholds that both the deification of Christ’s manhood and the condescendence of his godhead do by no means affect the nature, especially of the godhead, yet also of manhood, but are to be seen as the result of the unifying divine dispensation. This dispensation provides the unity of both elements in Christ in that it was an exclusively divine initiative in which the Logos took a rationally ensouled flesh from the virgin Mary and united it with himself as his temple:

Willing to be seen, God united with himself a body which could be seen, and willing to suffer, God united with himself a body which was able to suffer voluntarily, not one subsisting beforehand, and united to him later one in virtue, nor from a simple human being called ‘Mary’. Yet, she was sanctified first and afterwards the Logos participated from her in the manhood and united with himself an ensouled body, so that one and the same should be God and man. [...] Without the Logos, I therefore do not acknowledge him as a subsisting human being, as I apprehend his constitution (ὑπαρξίς) in the unification with the Logos.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ *Dialogus* IV, 1 l. 7 (ed. Capone, 68); IV, 2 ll. 63 f. (ibid., 72); IV, 4 ll. 91–100 (ibid., 74); IV, 6 l. 165 (ibid., 80); IV, 8 ll. 221 f. 242 f. (ibid., 84.86); IV, 9 ll. 261–265 (ibid., 86). As the only extant parallel to this phrase (apart from the letter to Jovianus) can be found in Cyril’s apology for the eighth anathematism against Theodoretus (ACO I/1/6, 132, 19–21: ὁμολογῆται δὲ μᾶλλον θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ δι’ ἡμᾶς ἦτοι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος γεγινώς, οὐ μεταστάσις φύσεως τῆι κατ’ ἄλλοιῳσιν καὶ τροπῇ, ἀλλ’ ἐνώσεως οἰκονομία), where it is also immediately connected with a rejection of the homo assumptus, i.e. any preexistence of Christ’s humanity with respect to the incarnation (ibid. 11–16), one could be very tempted to assume a dependence of the pseudo-Athanasian dialogue on Cyril. However, as every other typically Cyrillian element, especially the ‘one nature’-formula, is absent from the dialogue, both will be probably drawing upon a common Alexandrian tradition.

¹⁶⁸ *Dialogus* IV, 2 (ed. Capone, 70): θεὸς βουλευθεὶς ὀφθῆναι ἤνωσεν ἑαυτῷ σῶμα τὸ δυνάμενον ὀφθῆναι καὶ βουλευθεὶς παθεῖν ἤνωσεν ἑαυτῷ σῶμα ἐμψυχον τὸ δυνάμενον παθεῖν ἐκουσίως, οὐ πρότερον ὑπάρξαν καὶ τότε κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνωθέν, οὕτε ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ἀπλῶς τῆς Μαρίας, ἀλλὰ πρότερον αὐτῆς ἁγιασθείσης καὶ τότε ἐξ αὐτῆς μετασχόντος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ ἐνώσαντος ἑαυτῷ κατ’ οἰκονομίαν ἐμψυχον σῶμα, ὥς εἶναι ἓνα τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον. Ἀπολ. Τὸ ἐμψυχον σῶμα ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστίν; Ὁρθ. Οὐχ ἀπλῶς τὸ ἐμψυχον σῶμα λέγω ἀνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σῶμα ἐμψυχον ὃν ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστίν. Ἀπολ. Ἀνθρώπος οὗτος Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν; Ὁρθ. Ἐνωθεὶς λόγῳ. Ἀπολ. Οὐκ ἐστίν οὖν Ἰησοῦς ἀνθρωπος; Ὁρθ. Ἄνευ τοῦ λόγου οὕτε ἀνθρωπον αὐτὸν οἶδα ὑποστάντα, τὴν γὰρ ὑπαρξιν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει τοῦ λόγου γνωρίζω.

The same point is made again a little later, responding to the Apollinarian's question regarding the difference between the saints' and Christ's participation in the divine Logos:

The saints existed first and then participated in the God-Logos. Yet here, this is not so, but the God-Logos, who existed before the eons, was willing to become man and thus sanctified the virgin and unified with himself from her a body which did not exist beforehand and was united later, but united it in the constitution (ὑπαρξίς) itself.¹⁶⁹

The unity between the two aspects in Christ is in both texts exclusively derived from the divine constitution or origin of his manhood—a derivation most probably based on the Cappadocian concept of *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως* (way of beginning/existing), i.e. the idea that an individual is permanently determined and distinguished from any other by the factors constituting its origin, which was most clearly elucidated by M. Richard in his famous article on the introduction of term 'hypostasis' into the Christological debate. There, he interprets mainly Gregory's of Nyssa conception of hypostasis as "constitution de l'individu comme tel, constitution qu'il tient de son origine et qui n'est en quelque sorte que son origine continuée".¹⁷⁰ Jesus Christ qua temple of the godhead is thus, as the dialogue expounds another time a little later, marked off from every saint the spirit indwells in that he is a living temple built immediately by the godhead himself and never to be encountered "empty or clean" of it.¹⁷¹

Yet, as the dialogue not yet connects this conception with the term 'hypostasis', it was its reception by the author of the letter to Jovianus which—on the basis of his 'insubistence formula'—made a connection between the Chalcedonian 'one hypostasis' and the Cyrillian opposition against any kind of homo assumptus-Christology, i.e. the preexistence of the human element in Christ, possible and sanctioned by the authority of Athanasius. That this was to become actually a proprium of Neochalcedonian theology can be shown by a comparison with the vast polemics of Cyril and the Monophysites against a *προδιάπλασις* before the incarnation,¹⁷² in which insubistence-language is, if it occurs at all, at best of minor

¹⁶⁹ *Dialogus* IV, 5 (ed. Capone, 78): οἱ ἄγιοι πρότερον ὑπῆρξαν καὶ τότε μετέσχον θεοῦ λόγου. ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ ὁ ὢν πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων θεὸς λόγος, βουλῆθεις ἐνανθρωπήσαι ἡγίασε τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἦνωσεν ἐαυτῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς σῶμα οὐ πρότερον ὑπάρξαν καὶ τότε ἐνώσας, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὑπάρξει ἐνώσας.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. bel. on John of Damascus at nn. 656–658.

¹⁷¹ *Dialogus* IV, 6 (ed. Capone, 80f.), partly quoted bel. n. 378.

¹⁷² Cf. Lebon, "Christologie", 436 f. 462–464.

importance. Severus for example says that both elements of Christ ὑφίστανται ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει ἢ συνθέσει, which means that the two elements subsist in the state of unity or composition,¹⁷³ and thus differs (at least terminologically) considerably from the Neochalcedonian claim that the human nature has its particular subsistence in the hypostasis of the Logos.

The description of the relationship between Logos and human nature as insubsistence is thus a Chalcedonian tradition, just as the reflection upon the term ἐνυπόστατος as to how it can be applied to a nature without a hypostasis of its own—a reflection which was, as we shall see, rather fruitfully redirected by Leontius of Byzantium.

3.2. LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM AND THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ΕΝΥΠΙΟΨΤΑΤΟΝ AND ΥΠΟΨΤΑΣΙΣ

3.2.1. *Interpreting the 'Locus Classicus'*

The focus of the discussion about our term on Leontius of Byzantium is partly due to Loofs' postulate of the fundamental unity of the *Corpus Leontianum*, which was refuted by the articles of M. Richard¹⁷⁴ and B. Daley.¹⁷⁵ Unlike Leontius of Jerusalem, Leontius of Byzantium is not a Neochalcedonian, but a Chalcedonian in the strict sense, to whom the Neochalcedonian emphasis on insubsistence is somewhat suspect.¹⁷⁶ Apart from the famous

¹⁷³ Apud Leontium Hierosolymitanum, *Against the Monophysites: Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae*, ed. P.T.R. Gray, Oxford 2006, 100 / apud Eustathium Monachum, *Epistula ad Timotheum scholasticum*, in: *Diversorum postchalcedonensium auctorum collectanea*, ed. P. Allen, Leuven 1989 (CCG 19), 417,116 (resumed by the Chalcedonian monk because of the seemingly self-contradictory plural 'natures' in 418,140 f.; 422,244 f.; 452,356 f.); 422,255 (= MSG 86/II, 1848A6–8: *Contra impium grammaticum* II,31; CSCO 111,238,7–9); cf. also the second letter against Sergius (ed. J. Lebon, Louvain 1949 [CSCO 120], 83,5–16; English translation in I.R. Torrance, *Christology after Chalcedon. Severus of Antioch & Sergius the Monophysite*, Norwich 1988, 176). However, Philoxenus used Syriac expressions similar to the Neochalcedonian ones (cf. R. Chesnut, *Three monophysite Christologies. Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug*, London 1976, 78–81, esp. 79).

¹⁷⁴ "Léonce de Jérusalem et Léonce de Byzance", in: *Opera minora*, vol. 3, Turnhout 1977, 53–88.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. "Personalism and Dialectics?" and "A Richer union" *passim*.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. *Epilysis*; MSG 86/II, 1944C. The people criticized here without being rejected as heretics can only be Neochalcedonians like John of Cesarea or Ephrem of Amid. Richard supposed those to be the ἀκροφιλόσοφοι (MSG 86/I, 1273B) CNE is directed against ("Léonce de Byzance, était-il origéniste?", in: REByz 5 [1947], [31–66] 53–55). However, there's no direct evidence for any rapports between Leontius and the Grammarian (cf. Uthemann, "Definitionen und Paradigmen", 95).

opening passage of the first section of the treatise against the Nestorians and Eutychians (CNE),¹⁷⁷ the term ἐνυπόστατος occurs only one other time in Leontius' works¹⁷⁸ and definitely does not contribute significantly to the systematic elaboration of his Christology. Although rather isolated in the work of Leontius himself,¹⁷⁹ the famous passage enjoyed a tremendous career not only in modern research, but already in the patristic authors after Leontius up to John of Damascus. We will leave the crucial passages of the text in Greek, because any attempt of translation would anticipate the decisions of interpretation to be discussed below:

Hypostasis, gentlemen, and the ἐνυπόστατον are not the same thing. For 'hypostasis' signifies the individual, but 'ἐνυπόστατον' the essence; and hypostasis marks off a person by means of its characteristic properties; τὸ δὲ ἐνυπόστατον τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸ συμβεβηκὸς δηλοῖ, ὃ ἐν ἐτέρῳ ἔχει τὸ εἶναι καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἑαυτῷ θεωρεῖται. Of this kind are the qualities, the so-called substantial and unsubstantial ones, none of which is a substance, i.e. an existing thing, but is always perceived 'around' the substance, like colour in a body and like knowledge in a soul.

¹⁷⁷ Abbreviations for Leontius' treatises according to B. Daley, "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium", in: JThS 27 (1976), (333–369) 333 n. 2. The only available edition is unfortunately still Mai/Minge, as Daley's critical text (*Leontius of Byzantium: a critical edition of his works with prolegomena*, Dissertation Oxford 1978) remains unpublished. I had, however, the opportunity to compare the Minge-quotations with a microfilm-version of it.

¹⁷⁸ CNE; MSG 86/I, 1300A: οὐσιώδης καὶ ἐνυπόστατος ἕνωσις cf. 1308C: καθ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποστατικῇ ἕνωσις. His favourite phrase seems to be οὐσιώδης ἕνωσις (CNE 1352D; DTN 1379A–D; *Epilysis* 1925C.1941A).

¹⁷⁹ The closest parallel contentwise is *Epilysis* 1920D–1921B, where the term itself, however, does not occur: "Thus, in case of the holy Trinity, we confess three hypostases, but preach one nature and substance of those without recognizing any of them as ἀνούσιος and without applying the number which would discretely quantify substances, as we know that this would entail their non-consubstantiality. The Arians were aware of this, when they applied the term 'substances' to the hypostases qua being ἐνούσιοι and linked with that their non-consubstantiality. Thus, in speaking of two natures in case of the dispensation, we manifest their specific difference, not their separation, and exclude, even though they are not ἀνυπόστατοι, any numbering of hypostases, just as we excluded there any numbering of substances. Nevertheless, none of the hypostases was confessed to be ἀνούσιος, just as here none of the natures is confessed to be ἀνυπόστατος. We know very well, that even in case of hypostatistically and substantially different things, like this individual horse, this individual cow and this individual man, the nature properly does not denote their (numerical) separation, but their (essential) difference, just as the hypostasis denotes their separation, but not the quiddity of the subject: if anywhere, then, the nature will manifest not separation but difference in case of those things which are not revealed by themselves, but are and come to be simultaneously and in one another (μὴ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ἐμφαινόμενων, ἀλλ' ἅμα τε καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλοις ὄντων τε καὶ γινομένων), be it in the context of theology, of theology or in the case of any other thing."

Whoever claims then that there is no anhypostatic nature, is admittedly right; but he does not draw the correct conclusion if he infers that everything not anhypostatic has to be a hypostasis. Analogously, one could correctly claim that there is no unshaped body, but would incorrectly infer that the shape is the body itself [1280A] and not rather something perceived in the body.

An anhypostatic nature, in the sense of substance, will never exist. Yet, nature is not hypostasis, as both terms are not convertible. For the hypostasis is also nature, but nature not yet hypostasis. To nature the concept of 'being' can be applied,¹⁸⁰ to hypostasis also the concept of 'being by itself'. The former corresponds¹⁸¹ to the species, the latter signifies the individual. The former reveals the character of a general entity, the latter singles out the individual from the common.

And to put it concisely: What is consubstantial and has the same definition is said to be of one nature. Yet, the definition of hypostasis is either 'what is identical according to its nature, but numerically different', or 'what consists of different natures and possesses a common existence simultaneously and in each other'. [B] They are sharing an existence not as if they would complete each other's substance (as to be seen in substances and their substantial predicates, which are called qualities), but on the grounds that neither of the two natures or substances is perceived by itself, but (only) accompanied by the other it is composed and grown together with (μετὰ τῆς συγκεκμηνης καὶ συμπεφυκυίας).¹⁸²

At first, we notice that our term is introduced once again on the occasion of the οὐκ ἔστι φύσις ἀνυπόστατος-objection. Yet, unlike in John of Cesarea, the crucial point is not the possibility of using ἐνυπόστατον or ὑπόστασις in a wider (existence in general) or narrower (self-subsisting existence) sense, but rather the distinction between ὑπόστασις and ἐνυπόστατον. The difficult point is how this difference has to be described according to our text, and especially what role Leontius' statements about accidents and qualities play in this description.

¹⁸⁰ λόγον τινος ἐπιδέχεσθαι is a typical logical expression in Aristotle, cf. e.g. Cat. 5 3b2–9: καὶ τὸν λόγον δὲ ἐπιδέχονται αἱ πρῶται οὐσίαι τὸν τῶν εἰδῶν καὶ τὸν τῶν γενῶν, καὶ τὸ εἶδος δὲ τὸν τοῦ γένους.—ὅσα γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ κατηγορουμένου λέγεται, καὶ κατὰ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου ῥηθήσεται.—ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸν τῶν διαφορῶν λόγον ἐπιδέχεται τὰ τε εἶδη καὶ τὰ ἄτομα· συνώνυμα δὲ γε ἦν ὦν καὶ τοῦνομα κοινὸν καὶ ὁ λόγος ὁ αὐτός. ὥστε πάντα τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν οὐσιῶν καὶ τῶν διαφορῶν συνωνύμως λέγεται.

¹⁸¹ λόγον ἐπέχειν: fulfil the function of, be analogous to, correspond to. (cf. e.g. Simplicius, *In Cael.*; CAG VII, 83,1; 84,19; 405,16 / Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 65,13 a.m.).

¹⁸² MSG 86/I, 1277D–1280B. The only difference between Daley's and Mingé's text in this passage is the omission of δ from MSG 86/I, 1277Dg: According to Daley's apparatus it was already deleted in the Vatican manuscript and is presented by no other witness. Variants affecting the content seem to be only attested in the excerpts from Leontius, where especially the ending of the passage was obviously pretty distorted.

The first crucial decision to be made here is whether the $\delta \text{ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἔχει}$ $\tau\acute{o} \text{ εἶναι}$ -clause is to be referred to $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$ or rather to συμβεβηχός . The first alternative appears (at first sight) to result in a self-contradiction, as it seems to make Leontius claim that a thing which has its being in another like an accident is not an accident. Hence, according to Loofs and Otto, in his description of inexistence Leontius does not speak about accidents in the strict sense at all, but rather about specific difference (ποιότης οὐσιώδης) and *inseparable* accident ($\text{ποιότης ἐπουσιώδης}$).¹⁸³ This identification, perfectly justified in the first case, is, however, rather problematic regarding the second case and the examples given by Leontius. In the commentators from Alexander of Aphrodisias onwards, ἐπουσιώδης always means the opposite of οὐσιώδης , i.e. non-substantial,¹⁸⁴ and the examples ‘colour’ and ‘science’ are classical quality-accidents according to Cat. 8. Even if one interpreted those examples, following D.B. Evans, only as vague “parallel[s]” concerning the mere fact of inexistence,¹⁸⁵ not as strict exemplifications of the type of inexistence Leontius has in mind, one would still have to explain why

¹⁸³ Cf. Loofs, “Leontius”, 62.66–68; Otto, *Person*, 25 f. A less differentiated version of this solution has recently been presented by C. dell’Osso, “Still on the concept of Enhypostaton”, in: *Augustinianum* 43 (2003), (63–80) 68–70, who wants to interpret our term—in complete disregard of the different contexts of its usage—as “provided with substantial qualities”. On the philosophical discussion of substantial qualities cf. bel. nn. 261–281. The interest sixth century Christian theologians took in this problem is testified to by Eutychius’ treatise on the distinction between nature and hypostasis (unfortunately surviving in Armenian translation only) which contains a cento of quotations from the Cappadocians on the terms εἶδος (?), ιδιότης and ποιότης οὐσιωδής (P. Paolo Ananian, “L’Opusculo di Eutichio patriarcha di Constantinopoli sulla distinzione della natura e persona”, in: *Armeniaca. Mélanges d’études Armeniennes publiés à l’occasion du 250^e anniversaire de l’entrée des pères mekhitaristes dans l’île de St. Lazare*, Venice 1969, [355–382] 378–380).

¹⁸⁴ Cf. e.g. Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 176,25 f. / Philoponus, *In Phys.*; CAG XVI, 38,25–39,3 / David, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/2, 164,22–24. The 18th of the Leontius-excerpts (MSG 86/II, 2009C; CPG 6819 [1]), which has no exact parallel in his extant works, is perfectly in line with the usage of the commentators in distinguishing the three ‘substantial’ voces (genus, species, difference) from the two ‘accidental’ ones (proprium, accident). The most comprehensive survey of Leontius’ philosophical knowledge is still Junglas, *Leontius*, 66–92 although it is surpassed in several details. On the later apparently exclusively Christian usage of ἐπουσιώδης cf. bel. nn. 359 f.

¹⁸⁵ *Leontius of Byzantium. An origenist Christology*, Washington 1970, 141, cf. 135. The whole passage (pp. 134–143) rests on his untenable postulate of a distinction between “mode of union” and “mode of nature” he wants to prove from the *Epilysis* (cf. Daley, “Origenism”, 347). As to the approximation of enhypostasized nature and accident, M. Richard goes even further and claims that Leontius’ theory renders “l’opposition de la substance et de l’accident [...] plus apparente que réelle”, although he refers—like Loofs, Daley and Grillmeier—the $\delta \text{ ἐν ἑτέρῳ}$ -clause to συμβεβηχός (“Léonce et Pamphile”, in: *Opera Minora*, vol. III, Turnhout 1977, [27–52] 36 cf. 32 f.).

Leontius in the concluding part of the passage strictly marks off his 'hypostasized' natures from qualities, especially from substantial ones, in order to avoid monophysitism.

If the $\delta \text{ ἐν ἐτέρῳ ἔχει τὸ εἶναι}$ -clause is, however, to be referred to συμβεβηκός , as Daley and Grillmeier took it,¹⁸⁶ the passage becomes even more problematic: If Leontius wants to describe the difference between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον , why does he dwell so extensively on the ontological status of qualities, which does not have anything to do with the entities in question (i.e. hypostasis and substance resp. ἐνυπόστατον), but does not say anything about those entities themselves? Thus, Uthemann in my opinion correctly insisted upon the insufficiency of their account,¹⁸⁷ even if his proposal of a text-alteration is not convincing.¹⁸⁸

The only way of overcoming this dilemma is a careful step-by-step reconstruction of Leontius' argument: Firstly, he parallels the relation between ὑπόστασις and ἐνυπόστατον with the one between οὐσία and ἐνούσιον , clearly on the basis of the Neonicene trinitarian terminology.¹⁸⁹ Just as only a hypostasis, i.e. an individual, can be ἐνούσιος , i.e. possessing substance or belonging to a species, only a substance or species can be ἐνυπόστατος , i.e. realized in a concrete individual. There are, however, different kinds of realizations in a concrete individual, the determination of which constitutes the second step of Leontius' argument: If we speak of an ἐνυπόστατον , the inexistent reality is a *substantially* constituent factor of an individual, i.e. not an accident, but nevertheless does not subsist in itself. Such a kind of inexistence characterizes the substantial and non-substantial qualities which are *always* concomitant with a substance, but none of which is itself a substance, at least in the sense of 'subsisting entity' (Aristotelian primary substance). If, however, those substantial qualities are never without substances, but by no means substances themselves, the hypostasized nature is also by no means liable to be itself hypostasis, even though it is always concomitant with a hypostasis. At this point, Leontius reveals his inspiration for his so widely influential solution of the $\text{οὐκ ἔστι φύσις ἀνυπόστατος}$ -

¹⁸⁶ Daley, "Personalism or Dialectics", 18f.; "A Richer union", 250 n. 59 / Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 204–206.

¹⁸⁷ "Definitionen und Paradigmen", 99 f.; cf. also dell'Osso, "Concept", 67.

¹⁸⁸ "Definitionen und Paradigmen", 101 n. 105 he proposes: $\text{τὸ δὲ ἐνυπόστατον τῷ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸ συμβεβηκός δηλοῖ, ὅτι ἐν ἐτέρῳ ἔχει τὸ εἶναι καὶ οὐκ ἐν αὐτῷ θεωρεῖται}$. Even less adequate is his insistence on a destruction of the ὥς with GcP-construction in 1280B4–7 (p. 103 n. 157).

¹⁸⁹ For the use of ἐνούσιον (a term which was probably not very prominent before the late fourth century) in the Cappadocians cf. *Lexicon Gregorianum*, ed. F. Mann, Vol. II, Leiden e.a. 2001, 787.

objection: He conceives of it as analogous to the philosophical axiom οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα ἀσχημάτιστον.¹⁹⁰ Just as no body can be imagined or exist without shape, but nevertheless is not its shape itself, a nature cannot be imagined or exist without at least one hypostasis, but is nevertheless not identical with it. Leontius thus clearly conceives of the hypostatical realization of a nature in a certain analogy with the relation between a nature and its necessary qualities.¹⁹¹ Just as no (physical) body can exist without shape or colour of some kind, the soul will also be necessarily accompanied by some kind of knowledge. In his use of the term ἐπουσιώδης he was thus probably somewhat misled by the close link of the term to property and inseparable accident, which was customary within the exegetical tradition on Porphyry's *Isagoge*.¹⁹²

Afterwards, Leontius goes to argue that the opponents' celebrated objection only holds true if the term nature is to be understood in the sense of οὐσία. The term 'nature' per se, however, is by no means convertible with (and thus neither immediately entails) 'hypostasis', as the two terms differ (1) in meaning, (2) in reference, (3) in function (1280A):

- (1) the former means just being, not yet individual, self-subsisting being,
- (2) the former primarily signifies species, the latter individuals,
- (3) the former "reveals the character of a general thing" (i.e. is used as a proper concept), the latter "singles out the individual from the common" (i.e. is basically used like a name).

At this point, the line of argument is cut off to present some sort of summary resuming the trinitarian-christological ἐμπάλιν¹⁹³ already hinted at in the

¹⁹⁰ Cf. e.g. Dexippus, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/2, 23,20 (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄχρουν ἢ ἀσχημάτιστον ἢ ἄποσον σῶμα) / Hermeias, *In Phaedrum*, ed. Couvreur, 112,1f. (σῶμα ἐνυλον ἀδύνατόν σε λαβεῖν ἀχρώματον καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον) / Simplicius, *In Cael.*; CAG VII, 599,9f. (οὔτε δὲ ἀχρώματον πάντη οὔτε ἀσχημάτιστον εἶναι σῶμα δυνατόν πεπερασμένον) and *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 48,5 (ἄχρουν γὰρ καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον οὐκ ἂν εἴη σῶμα). The reference to this axiom in the context of a discussion of the relationship between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις might have been suggested to Leontius by Basil (?), *Ep.* 38,7,27–33; ed. Courtonne, vol. 1, 91 (cf. also Basil, *Chr. Eunom.* 1,6 [MSG 29, 524A] / Gregory of Nyssa, *De hominis opificio* 24 [MSG 44, 213A/B]).

¹⁹¹ Thus, his use of the term ποιότης finally goes back to the Stoic, not to the Aristotelian tradition. Cf. Anastasius Sinaites, *Hodegos* II, 7,47–51 (CCG 8, 62): Ποιότης ἐστὶν ἐνούσιος δύναμις, ὡς τοῦ ὕδατος ἢ ψυχρότης, καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἢ θερμότης, καὶ τοῦ λίθου ἢ σκληρότης, καὶ τῆς γῆς ἢ ξηρότης. Ποιότης καὶ ιδιότης καὶ διαφορὰ καὶ ἰδίωμα ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνει (and the parallels in Uthemann's apparatus).

¹⁹² Cf. e.g. Ammonius, *In Isagog.* (CAG IV/3, 33,30f.; 101,3; 109,2f.; 121,9f.); Philoponus, *In Anal. pr.* (CAG XIII/2, 276,12f.; 313,6f.).

¹⁹³ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 101,20f. (ed. P. Galloway, Paris 1974 [SC 208], 44f.): "And to put it concisely: the things the Saviour is made up from are two different entities (ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο),

beginning: To put it shortly, the things properly said to be of one nature are the con-substantial hypostases, whereas co-hypostatical things would only be imaginable in the case of a composite hypostasis combining in itself different natures. That such a composite hypostasis exists e.g. in the case of human beings made up of body and soul, Leontius infers from a twofold definition of 'hypostasis' he obviously regards as traditional. This definition, however, additionally provides him with the opportunity also to clarify the dissimilarity-moment in the analogy he had stated between the inexistence of natures and substantial qualities: In contrast to genus and specific difference, the two natures united in the composite hypostasis do not complete each other's essence like 'animal' and 'rational'. In fact, they are complete, fully determined essences in themselves, which are nevertheless not perceived in themselves, but always μετὰ τῆς συγκειμένης καὶ συμπεφυκυίας.

To conclude, we actually have to choose the first alternative of interpretation which states a parallel or rather an analogy between the inexistence of natures and substantial qualities comprising aspects of both similarity and dissimilarity: Just like the latter, natures necessarily inexist in hypostases, cannot be without them and make them what they are. However, unlike the latter, they are by no means essential parts of each other, which would make up one essence or nature, but rather coexist as wholes fully determined in themselves, yet never to be perceived without the other. The reading of the crucial sentence proposed here is thus basically the one suggested not only by modern scholars like Otto or Uthemann, but already by prominent ancient readers of Leontius like John of Damascus.¹⁹⁴

as the invisible is not identical with the visible and neither the timeless with the one subject to time, not two different persons (ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος). Absit! For both is one by the mixture, as God was made man and man was made God, or however one would like to call it. I say two different entities, exactly the opposite way (ἐμπαλιν) as in case of the trinity. There we have different persons, lest we confuse the hypostases, yet not different entities, as the three persons are one and the same thing with respect to the godhead". On the importance of this topos for Leontius cf. my "Vermischt, ausgetauscht und kreuzweis zugesprochen. Zur wechselförmigen Geschichte der Idiome Christi in der alten Kirche", in: *Creator est creatura. Luthers Christologie als Lehre von der Idiomenkommunikation*, ed. O. Bayer/B. Gleede, Berlin/New York 2007 (TBT 138), (35–94) 75 n. 141.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. ab. n. 183 and John of Damascus, *Contra Jacobitas* 11,15 f., in: *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* IV, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1981 (PTS 22) 114 (treated extensively bel. at nn. 633–640). Cf. Lang, "Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos", 651 f.

3.2.2. *Leontius and the Insubsistence Formula*

If this interpretation is correct, what should we make of Leontius' scepticism with regard to the Christological insubsistence formula? The passage *Epily-sis* 1944C, where Loofs wanted to find it, obviously represents the Neochalcedonian stance criticized by Leontius, as for him the singularity of Christ's hypostasis is not to be explained just by the fact that his human nature did not preexist the incarnation but took its subsistence in the Logos.¹⁹⁵ This criticism is part of Leontius' general attitude to analyse the 'mode of union' as it is presented in the concrete biography of Christ, rather than the 'mode of union', i.e. how divine and human nature could be able to perform the act of incarnation.¹⁹⁶ Thus, he probably regards the insubsistence-conception suggested e.g. by the letter to Jovianus¹⁹⁷ as inane speculation about the divine-human union and as a misleading explanation of their perfectly symmetric union. However, he makes use of an alternative 'formula' which will be used alongside or even interchangeably with the insubsistence formula in later authors: The complete manhood of the Logos, he says, is, like our inner man according to the Apostle (Eph 3:16f.), *συννυφεστώς* and completes the definition of the whole after the union.¹⁹⁸

The reason why despite his reservation concerning the relevant Christological tradition he takes the inexistence of natures for granted in our passages has to be sought in the philosophical background of the formula. Philoponus, for example, says: "For the animal in itself, which is neither Plato nor any other individual man, is not in existence, as the general entities are perceived in the many and individually".¹⁹⁹ And in his commentary

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Daley, "Origenism", 360–362. Some of Leontius' arguments come, however, pretty close to the Neochalcedonian insubsistence-theory, e.g. *Epilysis* 1937AB and especially CA 1352C–1353A, which is strongly reminiscent of the fourth pseudo-Athanasian dialogue and Pamphilus' adaption of Theodoretus (cf. bel. nn. 370–377).

¹⁹⁶ Cf. *Epilysis* 1940C; Daley, "A Richer Union", 261.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. ab. n. 164.

¹⁹⁸ DTN; MSG 86/I, 1380C; *Epilysis* 1917C.

¹⁹⁹ *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 58,15–17: οὐ γὰρ ἔστι τὸ ζῶον καθ' ἑαυτὸ ἐν ὑπάρξει, ὁ μῆτε ἀνθρωπὸς ἔστι μῆτε Πλάτων μῆτε τις τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀνθρώπων· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ καθ' ἑκάστον τὰ κοινὰ θεωρεῖται. Cf. also Elias, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/1, 48,27–29 / Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 80,30 f. (According to Aristotle, the secondary substance ἔχει τὸ εἶναι ἐν τῇ primary); 82,6–9 (Alexander's corresponding stance) / Id., *In Phys.*; CAG IX, 490,4–11 (every κοινὸν ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἑκάστα τὴν ὑπάρξιν ἔχει). That this was a quite common description of how universals subsist also among Christian authors can be seen e.g. from Basil, *De Spiritu sancto* XVII, 41,17–21; ed. B. Pruche, Paris 1968 (SC 17), 394: 'Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν πιστεύοιμεν εἰς τοσοῦτον αὐτοὺς παραπληξίας ἐλαύνειν, ὥστε φάναι τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ὄλων, ὥσπερ κοινότητά τινα, λόγῳ μόνῃ θεωρητὴν, ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ δὲ ὑποστάσει τὸ εἶναι ἔχουσιν, εἰς τὰ ὑποκείμενα διαίρεισθαι.

on the *Physics*, he refers to the post-res universals as “that which is said to commonly inhere all things and have its being in the many” (τὰ κοινῶς λεγόμενα ἐνυπάρχειν πᾶσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἔχειν τὸ εἶναι) and to the in-rebus ones as “that which has a common essence, but exists on its own in every single instance and is real in the individual things” (τὰ κοινήν οὐσίαν ἔχοντα, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἐν ἑκάστω ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ἐν ὑποστάσει ὄντα ἐν τοῖς καθ’ ἑκάστα).²⁰⁰ If Leontius then distinguishes the ἐνυπόστατον referred to Christ’s natures existing in his hypostasis from the καθ’ αὐτό of this hypostasis itself, one must ask to what extent he (and his theological successors) is drawing here on the philosophical discussion of this opposition, and whether maybe his specifications of this existence ‘not by itself, but in something else’ can also be explained and elucidated from this background.

3.3. PHILOSOPHICAL EXCURSUS:

THE DISTINCTIO ΚΑΘ’ ΑΥΤΟ—ΕΝ ΑΛΛΩ, THE PROBLEM OF SUBSTANTIAL QUALITIES AND INEXISTING NATURES

3.3.1. *Origin and Problems of the Distinction*

The distinction καθ’ αὐτό—ἐν ἄλλω, which is to be regarded as a commonplace in the philosophy of late antiquity, can be traced back to the basic divisions of the systems of categories developed simultaneously in the Peripatos and the Academy. The former based its teaching upon Aristotle’s *Categories*, the starting point of which is the partition of (according to an ontological reading of the *Categories*) entities into καθ’ ὑποκειμένου λεγόμενα and ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ ὑποκειμένῳ ὄντα (Cat. 2 1a16–b9).²⁰¹ The basic opposition of the Platonists was καθ’ αὐτό—πρός τι,²⁰² but as already Plato himself in the famous ascent-passage of his *Symposion* (211a/b) had distinguished the καθ’ αὐτό of the idea from the ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ of its likenesses,²⁰³ the second

²⁰⁰ CAG XVII, 779,28–30.

²⁰¹ Cf. A. Graeser, “Aspekte der Ontologie in der Kategorienschrift”, in: *Zweifelhaftes im Corpus Aristotelicum. Studien zu einigen Dubia. Akten des 9. Symposium Aristotelicum* (Berlin, 7.-16. September 1981), ed. P. Moraux / J. Wiesner, Berlin/New York 1983, 31–55.

²⁰² Cf. H.J. Krämer, *Platonismus und hellenistische Philosophie*, Berlin/New York 1971, 94–103.

²⁰³ *Werke*. Vol. 3: *Phaidon, Das Gastmahl, Kratylos*, ed. G. Eigler, Darmstadt 1990, 346 f.: οὐδ’ αὖ φαντασθήσεται αὐτῷ τὸ καλὸν οἷον πρόσωπόν τι οὐδὲ χεῖρες οὐδὲ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ὧν σῶμα μετέχει, οὐδέ τις λόγος οὐδέ τις ἐπιστήμη, οὐδέ που ὅν ἐν ἐτέρῳ τινι, οἷον ἐν ζώῳ ἢ ἐν γῇ ἢ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἢ ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ καθ’ αὐτὸ μεθ’ αὐτοῦ μονοειδὲς αἰεὶ ὄν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα καλὰ ἐκείνου μετέχοντα τρόπον τινὰ τοιοῦτον, οἷον γιγνομένων τε τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ἀπολλυμένων μηδὲν ἐκείνου μήτε τι πλεόν μήτε ἔλαττον γίνεσθαι μηδὲ πάσχειν μηδέν.

element of this distinction was soon replaced by ἐν ἄλλῳ or ἐν ἐτέρῳ, which was perfectly compatible with Aristotle's ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ.²⁰⁴ According to Cat. 2, this notion of being in a subject applies, however, only to the accidental categories which are neither *synonymously* predicated of the subject (1b2 f.; 2a27–34) nor are a part of the entity or its definition (1a21 f. cf. 3a9 f. 22–32)²⁰⁵ nor can be separated from the subject. Loofs' claim that “bei Aristoteles das Genus und die διαφοραί, welche die δευτέρα οὐσία constituieren, individualisiert werden durch das εἶναι ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ”,²⁰⁶ seems to be nevertheless justified, inasmuch as these strict regulations are not strictly followed by Aristotle, even in the *Categories* themselves: Although any kind of accidental inherence of the secondary substances in the primary ones is explicitly rejected in 3a9–15, secondary substances and accidents share in their dependence on primary substances, as Aristotle denies also to the former the character of a τὸδε τι. They are said to be “rather a quality” (3b15 f.) and to “determine the quality with reference to a substance” (3b20), because they lack the unity demanded of a proper substance.²⁰⁷ In the *Physics* and

²⁰⁴ The first testimony for this—as far as I can see—is Ps-Archytas, Περὶ τοῦ καθόλου λόγου, which reflects the discussion of Aristotle's categories in the first century BC. Cf. Th.A. Szlezák, *Pseudo-Archytas über die Kategorien*, Berlin/New York 1972, 34,15–17 (οὐσία ὅσα καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὑφέστηκεν—ποιότης ὅσα ἀπλῶς συνυπάρχει τινί); 36,18–20; 42,21–44,1 (τὸ δὲ καθ' αὐτὸ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐτέρῳ τινὶ συνυπάρχειν οὐσίας οἰκείον· πάσα γὰρ οὐσία καθ' αὐτήν, τὰ δὲ συνυπάρχοντα καὶ συμβεβηκότα ἢ ἐν ταύτῃ, φημί, ἢ οὐκ ἄνευ ταύτης). On the origin of this distinction in Eudoros of Alexandria's criticism of the *Categories* cf. *ibid.* 130 f.

²⁰⁵ Cf. also *Metaphysics* V, 25 1023b23–25; *Physics* IV, 3 210a19 f. Pace Graeser, “Aspekte der Ontologie”, 45 (and de Rijk, *ibid.* n. 25) a reference to both ‘material’ and ‘formal’ parts of an entity seems quite plausible to me. Cf. R. Thiel, *Aristoteles' Kategorienschrift in ihrer antiken Kommentierung*, Tübingen 2004 (PhU 11), 249.

²⁰⁶ Cf. *ab.* n. 128.

²⁰⁷ Cf. esp. Cat. 5 3b13–23: ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν δευτέρων οὐσιῶν φαίνεται μὲν ὁμοίως τῷ σχήματι τῆς προσηγχορίας τὸδε τι σημαίνειν, ὅταν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπον ἢ ζῶον· οὐ μὴν ἀληθές γε, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ποιόν τι σημαίνει, —οὐ γὰρ ἔν ἐστι τὸ ὑποκείμενον ὥσπερ ἡ πρώτη οὐσία, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πολλῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος λέγεται καὶ τὸ ζῶον—οὐχ ἀπλῶς δὲ ποιόν τι σημαίνει, ὥσπερ τὸ λευκόν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο σημαίνει τὸ λευκόν ἀλλ' ἢ ποιόν, τὸ δὲ εἶδος καὶ τὸ γένος περὶ οὐσίαν τὸ ποιόν ἀφορίζει, —ποιόν γὰρ τινα οὐσίαν σημαίνει.— ἐπὶ πλείον δὲ τῷ γένει ἢ τῷ εἶδει τὸν ἀφορισμὸν ποιεῖται· ὁ γὰρ ζῶον εἰπὼν ἐπὶ πλείον περιλαμβάνει ἢ ὁ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Accordingly, the antiplatonic passage in *Topics* IX (Soph. elench.), 22 178b37–39 says: τὸ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἄπαν τὸ κοινὸν οὐ τὸδε τι ἀλλὰ τοιόνδε τι ἢ ποσὸν ἢ πρὸς τι ἢ τῶν τοιούτων τι σημαίνει. On the claim of unity as Aristotle's decisive motive cf. J. Halfwassen, art. “Substanz, Substanz/Akzidens I. Antike”, in: HWP 10 (1998) (495–507) col. 499: “Das Einzelne ist [...] darum der letzte Seinsträger, weil es als Unteilbares den höchsten Einheitsgrad verwirklicht, während die Gattungen in ihre Arten und diese in die [...] Individuen unterteilbar sind.” In *Metaphysics* VII, 13–16 he rejects the substantiality of every universal and claims (1038b34–1039a1): ἔκ τε δὴ τούτων θεωροῦσι φανερόν ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν καθόλου ὑπαρχόντων οὐσία ἐστὶ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲν σημαίνει τῶν κοινῇ κατηγορουμένων τὸδε τι, ἀλλὰ τοιόνδε. (cf. 1038b25: ἔκ ποιού). Of course the Greek term ποιόν is subject to crucial ambiguities, as it can also mean “what kind of” and in this case clearly does not refer

Metaphysics, an admittedly rather vague concept of forms or species ‘inherent’²⁰⁸ in their instances is even quite prominent: In *Physics* II,1 we read: “the nature is always in a substrate”²⁰⁹ or “the nature and the substance of the natural things seems to some people to be the first inherent thing for everything”.²¹⁰ In the *Metaphysics* Aristotle often speaks about the ἐνεῖναι or ἐνυπάρχειν of the constituent causes in the entities constituted by them, esp. the inexistence of the form in the matter.²¹¹

Nevertheless, the difference between the inherence of an accident in a subject and that of a nature, species or form in matter, is pretty clear in Aristotle: The latter is a merely conceptual inherence, as matter receives its actual reality only from form and does not even exist as this concrete entity (τόδε τι) without it, whereas the subject of accidents serves as an actual, concrete substratum (*Metaphysics* IX,7 1049a27–b2 cf. 1038b5 f.; 1044b8 f.). Accordingly, on several occasions Alexander of Aphrodisias answers the question whether form or soul is said to be in matter or body as in its subject in the very same way: As it is form which enables matter to serve as this concrete subject, it is a constitutive part of the composite entity and thus excluded by the ‘not as a part’ criterium from Cat. 2 1a24 f.²¹² However, on

to (accidental) qualification, but to (substantial) specification (cf. e.g. F.J. de Haas, *John Philoponus’ New Definition of Prime Matter: Aspects of its Background in Neoplatonism and the Ancient Commentary Tradition*, Leiden/New York 1997 [PhA 69], 181–188).

²⁰⁸ The verbs ἐνεῖναι, εἶναι ἐν, ἐνυπάρχειν, ὑπάρχειν ἐν are often substituted for ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ (cf. C.-H. Chen, “On Aristotle’s two expressions: καθ’ ὑποκειμένου λέγεσθαι and ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ εἶναι. Their Meaning In Cat. 2, 1a20–b9 and the extension of this meaning”, in: *Phronesis* 2 [1957], [148–159] 158 f.). ἐνυπάρχειν is also used quite often in the logical sense of ‘being included in’, e.g. *De interpretatione* 11 21a15–30, *Analytica posteriora* I,4 73a34–b24 or I,22 84a7–28. In those logical contexts the ἐνυπάρχειν is of course denied to the accident, because it is not included in the definition. The expression ὑφιστάσθαι ἐν is used twice for the sinking down of liquid-sediments in vessels: *Meteorologica* II,3 357b3 f. and *De partibus animalium* IV,1 676a34 f. (cf. also *Problemata physica* 935a7 f.).

²⁰⁹ 192b34: ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ ἐστὶν ἡ φύσις αἰεί.

²¹⁰ 193a9–11: δοκεῖ δ’ ἡ φύσις καὶ ἡ οὐσία τῶν φύσει ὄντων ἐνίοις εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον ἐνυπάρχον ἐκάστῳ.

²¹¹ Cf. *Metaphysics* V,8 1017a14–21; VII,11 1037a29–b4; XII,4 1070b22 and also *De generatione et corruptione* 317a23 f.: Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸν λόγον, τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὕλην. Aristotle can also use λόγος instead of εἶδος or μορφή in opposition to matter (Cf. *Metaphysics* X,9 1058a37–b3).

²¹² Cf. *Mantissa* 5 (CAG suppl. II/1,119,21–122,15); *Problems and solutions* I,8 (CAG suppl. II/2,17,7–19,15); I,17 (ibid. 29,30–30,22) and I,26 (ibid. 41,20–43,17). Those texts are translated in R. Sorabji, *The philosophy of the commentators. A sourcebook*, Vol. 3: *Logic & Metaphysics*, London 2004, 122–124 and discussed by J. Ellis, “Alexander’s Defense of Aristotle’s *Categories*”, in: *Phronesis* 39 (1994) (69–89) 76–83. Interestingly enough, Alexander distinguishes attributes necessary for this or that concrete existence of the entity (shape and colour for a body) from those responsible for its being a concrete subject at all and allows for the former to inhere

one occasion, he also links the definition of ‘in a subject’ from Cat. 2 with another passage from Aristotle, the eight possible meanings of ἐν τινι listed in *Physics* IV,3 210a16–24.²¹³ Although this connection would dominate the entire discussion of the basic ontological distinction in Cat. 2 from Porphyry to the latest Alexandrian commentators, it clearly created more problems than it was able to solve in the end.

This result can almost be anticipated by a closer look at the context of the *Physics* passage: When analysing the essence of space, Aristotle had suggested in the preceding chapter that space could be considered either as the limit or form or as the extension or matter of things (IV,2 209b1–11). However, as space is separable from the entities in space, whereas form and matter are not, the essence of space can lie in neither of them:

Hence the place of a thing is neither a part nor a state of it, but is separable from it. For place is supposed to be something like a vessel, the vessel being a transportable place. But the vessel is no part of the thing.²¹⁴

Moreover, if an entity is admittedly moving in space and the form or matter in it would be its space, this would imply the absurdity of space moving in space (210a5–9). To avoid such absurdities, one has to determine, what ‘being in something’ exactly means:

After that we have to determine in how many senses one thing is said to be ‘in’ another: (1) As the finger is ‘in’ the hand and generally the part ‘in’ the whole. (2) As the whole is ‘in’ the parts, because there is no whole over and above the parts. (3) As man is ‘in’ animal and generally species ‘in’ genus. (4) As the genus is ‘in’ the species and generally the part of the species ‘in’ the definition of the species. (5) As health is ‘in’ [a certain proportion of] the hot and the cold and generally the form ‘in’ the matter. (6) As the affairs of

in the entity as in their subject whereas the latter make up the substantial form. Thus, he interprets the term τότε τι as metaphysically prior to ὑπόστασις or ὑφ’ ἑστέα: The substantial form constitutes a concrete subject, e.g. a concrete man, who is capable of bearing these or those attributes. The necessary attributes, however, constitute this concrete man of a certain colour, height etc. (CAG suppl. II/2, 18,8–17).

²¹³ CAG suppl. II/1,13,9–14,3. Here, Alexander wants to prove by exclusion of all other kinds of inexistence that soul has to inhere in body as form in matter. Accordingly, he alters Aristotle’s list for his purpose: “in the ruler” and the “in the good” can be omitted as obviously inapplicable to the relation of soul and body, but “accidents in a subject” (Pythagorean harmony) and “constituents in a mixture” (Stoic all-penetrating mixture) have to be added. Commenting on *Metaphysics* V,23 1023a24 f. he accepts also the “in the ruler” as a kind of ἐν τινι (CAG I, 421,20–29).

²¹⁴ *Physics* IV,2 209b27–30: ὥστε οὔτε μόριον οὐθ’ ἐξίς ἀλλὰ χωριστὸς ὁ τόπος ἐκάστου ἐστί. καὶ γὰρ δοκεῖ τοιοῦτό τι εἶναι ὁ τόπος ὁλον τὸ ἀγγεῖον (ἐστὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀγγεῖον τόπος μεταφορητός). τὸ δ’ ἀγγεῖον οὐδὲν τοῦ πρᾶγματός ἐστιν.

the Greeks centre 'in' the ruler, and generally events centre 'in' their primary motive agent. (7) As the existence of a thing centres 'in' its good and generally 'in' its end, i.e. in 'that for the sake of which' it exists. (8) In the strictest sense of all, as something is 'in' a vessel, and generally 'in' place.²¹⁵

The list is carefully designed for Aristotle's present purposes: (1)–(4) are two pairs of opposite relationships showing the dialectical character of the metaphor, (5)–(7) reproduce the four causes described in II,3 and (8) refers to its concrete, basic meaning. The intention of this distinction is significantly different from that of the *Categories*: In the *Physics*, Aristotle mainly seems to aim at a solution of Zeno's dilemma (ibid. 210b21–27) by showing that localization is only one of the many possible meanings of ἔν τι. In contrast, Cat. 2 aims at an all-embracing distinction of entities in order to induce the absolute priority of primary substances (cf. Cat. 5 2a34–2b6) so that it is hardly in accord with Aristotle's intention to explain the ἔν ὑποκειμένῳ εἶναι as a species of the genus ἔν τι presented in the *Physics*.

However, in Porphyry's short dialogue on the *Categories*, we encounter an idea which was to become an integral part of the whole subsequent discussion, i.e. that Aristotle's twofold specification of 'in a subject' ('not as a part', 'inseparable') was intended to exclude all²¹⁶ other kinds of inherence listed in the *Physics* and thus to specify the peculiar way in which only accidents inhere.²¹⁷ Considering Alexander's quite clear expositions of the

²¹⁵ Ibid. IV,3 210a16–24: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ληπτέον ποσαχῶς ἄλλο ἐν ἄλλῳ λέγεται. ἓνα μὲν δὴ τρόπον ὡς ὁ δάκτυλος ἐν τῇ χειρὶ καὶ ὅλως τὸ μέρος ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ. ἄλλον δὲ ὡς τὸ ὅλον ἐν τοῖς μέρεσιν· οὐ γάρ ἐστι παρὰ τὰ μέρη τὸ ὅλον. ἄλλον δὲ τρόπον ὡς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ζώῳ καὶ ὅλως εἶδος ἐν γένει. ἄλλον δὲ ὡς τὸ γένος ἐν τῷ εἶδει καὶ ὅλως τὸ μέρος τοῦ εἶδους ἐν τῷ λόγῳ. ἔτι ὡς ἡ ὑγίεια ἐν θερμοῖς καὶ ψυχροῖς καὶ ὅλως τὸ εἶδος ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ. ἔτι ὡς ἐν βασιλείᾳ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ ὅλως ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ κινητικῷ. ἔτι ὡς ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ καὶ ὅλως ἐν τῷ τέλει· τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τὸ οὐ ἕνεκα. πάντων δὲ κυριώτατον τὸ ὡς ἐν ἀγγείῳ καὶ ὅλως ἐν τόπῳ. In *Metaphysics* V, where one would expect such a distinction in the first place, we are just told that the kinds of ἔν τι have to be distinguished according to the kinds of ἔχειν (V,23 1023a24f.). *Topics* VI,6 144b31–145a1 presupposes a discussion similar to that of the *Physics*, when Aristotle makes clear that ἔν τι-*differentiae* like ἔνυδρον do not specify a genus by localisation (ποῦ), but by quality (ποιόν).

²¹⁶ In *Aristotelis categorias expositio per interrogationem et responsionem* (CAG IV/1, 78,10–21) claims—in contrast to the later commentators—that the two criteria only exclude 'part in whole' and 'in a vessel'. In this case, however, the *Physics*-passage would not be very valuable for explaining Cat. 2. Dexippus conceals this problem in that he only mentions 'genus in species', 'species in genus' and 'whole in parts' as possible candidates for a confusion. For him, all three can be excluded by the 'not as a part'-criterion, as species are also *conceived of* as parts of their genera and the singular subjects are parts of their wholes (In Cat. I, 23; CAG IV/2, 24,19–25,7).

²¹⁷ In Cat. (CAG IV/1, 77,18–37): Φημί ὅτι ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ ἔφη ἐκεῖνο εἶναι τὸ ἐν τι. ὅν· ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ τὸ ἐν τι ὅν πλεοναχῶς δηλοῦται καὶ ἐστὶν ὁμώνυμον, δεῖ προστεθῆναι τινα, ἵνα δ' ἰδίως βούλεται ἐν τι σημαντικόν εἶναι τοῦ συμβεβηκότος καὶ τοῦ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ ἀφορισθῆ. ἐστὶ τοίνυν τὸ ἐν τι τῶν

difference between ‘formal’ and ‘accidental’ inherence, Porphyry’s result is astonishing: He assigns ‘accidental’ inherence to the class ‘form in matter’ on the basis of the inseparability-criterion.²¹⁸ If one sticks to the *Physics* list without adding ‘accident in a subject’ as a separate species, as Alexander did,²¹⁹ this is of course the only plausible candidate. There was, however, also a systematic justification for Porphyry’s claim, which might be interpreted as echoing in some sense the Platonic distrust of the stability of sensible substance:²²⁰ the Platonic adaption of the Stoic double substratum. As Simplicius reports, in his large commentary on the *Categories* Porphyry had encountered the objections of the 2nd century Platonists Lucius and Nicostratus²²¹ against Aristotle’s definition of ‘being in a subject’ as excluding essential attributes despite their attributive (i.e. accidental) character by drawing on a Stoic, relative notion of ‘subject’ or substratum: The subject which the essential attributes (e.g. colour or shape of body) inhere in and thus retain their attributive character is, Porphyry says, to be identified with the first subject (i.e. prime matter), not with the second one, the concrete body, of which they are substantial parts and thus do not inhere in it as their subject.²²²

πλεοναχῶς λεγομένων· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἐν τόπῳ ἐν τινὶ λέγεται ὡς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ὁ Σωκράτης ἢ ἐν Λυκείῳ ἢ ἐν βαλανείῳ ἢ ἐν θεάτρῳ. ἔστιν ἐν τινὶ καὶ τὸ ὡς ἐν ἀγγεῖῳ οἶον ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐκπόματι τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀμφορεῖ ὁ οἶνος. ἔστιν ἐν τινὶ καὶ τὸ ὡς μέρος ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ ὥσπερ ἡ χεὶρ ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σώματι. ἔστιν ἐν τινὶ καὶ τὸ ὥσπερ τὸ ὅλον ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς αὐτοῦ μέρεσιν. ἔστιν ἐν τινὶ καὶ τὸ ὡς ἐν τῷ γένει τὸ εἶδος καθάπερ ἐν τῷ ζῳῳ ὁ ἄνθρωπος· περιέχεται γὰρ τὸ εἶδος ὑπὸ τὸ γένος. ἔστιν ἐν τινὶ ὡς γένος ἐν τῷ εἶδει· μετέχει γὰρ τὰ εἶδη τοῦ γένους· τὸ γὰρ ζῷον κατηγορεῖται τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς μετεχόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ἔστιν ἐν τινὶ ὡς τὸ ἐν τέλει εἶναι· ἐν γὰρ τῷ εὐδαιμονεῖν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τέλος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τὰ πάντα ἐστὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. ἔστι δὲ ἄλλο ἐν τινὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ κρατοῦντι, ὡς λέγομεν ἐν τῷ βασιλεῖ εἶναι τὰ πράγματα. ἄλλο δὲ πάλιν ἐν τινὶ τὸ ὡς ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ τὸ εἶδος καθάπερ ἐν τῷ χαλκῷ ἢ μορφῇ τοῦ ἀνδριάντος κἂν τῷ σιδήρῳ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς μαχαίρας κἂν τῇ ψυχῇ ἢ ἐπιστήμῃ κἂν τῷ σώματι τὸ χρῶμα. In this passage, Boethius seems to follow Porphyry very closely (cf. *In Cat.*; MSL 64, 172B–173C) differing only in that he also has ‘in place’ excluded by the inseparability-criterion (172D–173A).

²¹⁸ CAG IV/1, 78,6–9 (cf. Boethius, *In Cat.*; MSL 64, 173BC).

²¹⁹ The reason why the *Physics*-list lacks the final differentiation was assumed to be first of all pedagogical, as we learn from Simplicius (*In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 47,6–11: ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ τῆς Φυσικῆς τὸ ἐν τινὶ εἰς ὁκτώ διεῖλεν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης, τοῦ μὲν ἐν χρόνῳ μὴδὲ μνησθεὶς ὅλως, ἴσως μὲν διὰ τὸ μήπω τι περὶ τοῦ χρόνου εἰπεῖν, τὸ δὲ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ συνάψας τῷ ἐν ὕλῃ καὶ τὸ ἀγγεῖον δὲ καὶ τὸν τόπον συνήψεν διὰ τὸ μήπω τότε τὴν διαφορὰν εἰρηκεῖν).

²²⁰ A tradition eventually going back to *Timaeus* 49c–50a and usually connected with Plotinus’ description of the sensible substance as συμφόρησις τις ποιότητων καὶ ὕλης (Ennead VI 3, 8,20).

²²¹ On those cf. P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, vol. 2: *Der Aristotelismus im I. und II. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Berlin 1984, 528–554, esp. 536–539 (“In einem Subjekt sein”).

²²² Simpl., *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 48,1–33. The same passage is incorporated in Dexippus’

This solution implies, however, a dangerously analogous conception of the relation between matter and form and the one between sensible substance and accidents—an analogy which was of course useful in the context of Aristotelian exegesis, as it helps in explaining why Aristotle would have subsumed ‘accident in subject’ under ‘form in matter’ in the *Physics*.²²³ Systematically, however, it might reduce substantial forms to accidents of prime matter and thus degrade sensible substance to the Plotinian “mixture of qualities and matter” (VI 3, 8,19 f.). Yet, the later commentators were more irenic in their stance towards Aristotle than Plotinus and thus tried to mitigate his criticism or even transform it into a positive exegetical tool for developing the Aristotelian doctrine. Simplicius reports on a very interesting relecture of VI 3,8 by “better ones among the exegetes” which finds here the explanation why substance communicates its traits also to accidental entities: As sensible substance is a ‘mixture of qualities and matter’ in its own right, it is easily explicable that the traits of its elements are also retained by the mixture itself. The consequence emphasized by Plotinus, that in this case a substance would be made up of non-substances (against Cat. 5 3a29–31) and lose its substantial character, is avoided by a certain coordination of real intelligible and sensible substance: If the latter does not have to serve as the ultimate basis of reality, but only as its sensible likeness and copy, its being made up of nothing but matter and accidents will not be that much of a metaphysical problem.²²⁴

commentary without mentioning Porphyry’s name (*In Cat.* I,22; CAG IV/2, 23,17–24,18). For further differentiations cf. de Haas, *New definition*, 21 f. n. 77.

²²³ Cf. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis physicorum libros commentaria*, CAG IX, 552,18–29, esp. 27–29; ἔοικεν οὖν ὡς ἐν λαμβάνειν τό τε ὡς εἶδος ἐν ὕλῃ καὶ τὸ κυρίως ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ κατὰ κοινήν τινα φύσιν τοῦ μορφωτικοῦ. ἀμφω γὰρ μορφωτικὰ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου ἐστί. In his commentary on Cat., however, Simplicius criticizes Jamblichus, because the latter wanted Aristotle to subsume ‘in a subject’ under ‘form in matter’ on the one hand (CAG VIII, 46,14–21), but emphasized the difference between those two kinds of inherence on the other (47,5–7). Apparently, Jamblichus tried to substantiate the former claim by *Physics* IV,3 210a20 f.; b25–27 interpreting Aristotle’s example for ‘form in matter’, ὑγίεια ἐν θερμοῖς καὶ ψυχροῖς, as inherence of the accidental disposition ‘health’ in substantial bodies of different temperature. Yet, this is not what Aristotle means: Defining ‘health’ as συμμετρία θερμῶν καὶ ψυχρῶν (*Topics* VI,6 145b8; *Physics* VII,3 246b5), he regards it as the form of symmetry imposed on the matter of different bodily temperatures.

²²⁴ CAG VIII, 95,34–96,19: Ἐκεῖνο δὲ ἀπορίας ἄξιον, πῶς τὸ μὴ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ὑπάρχοντα κοινῶς οὐχ ὡς συμβεβηκός τι δείκνυται· οὐ γὰρ κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι τὴν κοινωनीαν δείκνυσιν τῶν οὐσιῶν. πρὸς δ’ φασιν οἱ σπουδαιότεροι τῶν ἐξηγητῶν, ὅτι “ἡ αἰσθητὴ οὐσία συμφοράρσις τίς ἐστιν ποιότητων καὶ ὕλης, καὶ ὁμοῦ μὲν πάντα συμπαγέοντα μίαν ποιεῖ τὴν αἰσθητὴν οὐσίαν, χωρὶς δὲ ἕκαστον λαμβανόμενον τὸ μὲν ποιόν, τὸ δὲ ποσόν ἐστὶν ἢ τι ἄλλο. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἂν ἐλλείπον μήπω ἀπηρτισμένην παρέχεται τὴν αἰσθητὴν οὐσίαν, μέρος ἔσται τῆσδε τῆς οὐσίας· ὁ δ’ ἂν γενομένη τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἐπισυμβῇ, τὴν οἰκείαν ἔχει τάξιν τὴν ἐπικτητον, οὐ κρυπτόμενον ἐν τῷ

This strange attempt to defend Aristotle by dismissing one of his most basic metaphysical premissions (the priority of sensible substance or ultimate substantial form) shows the difficulties partly of Plotinus' and especially of Porphyry's attempt to justify Aristotle's ontology as analysis of the sensible realm only, not the intelligible one as well, which is to be conceived of in Platonic terms.²²⁵ For the present context, the most relevant problem was whether the sensible realm was really capable of 'substantiality' (οὐσία), and if so, where exactly it had to be located (in species or individuals) and how it had to be marked off against 'accidentality'. If genera, species and specific differences, forms, substantial and accidental attributes are all said to exist 'in' their subordinate entities and finally 'in' individuals, the question whether the Neoplatonic commentators were still able to make some sense of Aristotle's sensible substance to a certain extent coincides with the one whether they could precisely distinguish those different forms of 'in-being', at least between the substantial and the accidental one. We will therefore have a short look at their discussion of the ἐν τινι-list first in order to examine their account of the inexistence of universals (genera, species), forms and specific differences afterwards.

3.3.2. *Attempted Solutions in the Later Commentaries on Aristotle*

The discussion of Cat. 2 in the later commentators shows their intention to remain as faithful as possible to Aristotle's basic metaphysical principles, mainly in their attempt to prove the basic ontological distinction proposed in this passage to be both all-embracing and clear-cut: In the case of every single entity, it must be clearly recognizable whether it exists independently by itself (αὐθυπόστατον πράγμα; καθ' αὐτὸ ὑποστῆναι)²²⁶ and counts as substance, or rather exists in something else, a substratum, on which its exis-

μίγματι τῷ ποιοῦντι τὴν λεγομένην οὐσίαν, καὶ ἕκαστον μὲν τῶν συνιόντων οὐκ ἔστιν οὐσία, τὸ δὲ ὅλον τὸ ἐκ πάντων οὐσία ἐστίν. καὶ οὐ δυσχεραντέον, εἰ τὴν οὐσίαν τὴν αἰσθητὴν ἐξ οὐκ οὐσιῶν ποιοῦμεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ ὅλον ἀληθὴς ἦν οὐσία, ἀλλὰ μιμουμένη τὴν ἀληθῆ, ἥτις ἄνευ τῶν ἄλλων περὶ ἑαυτὴν ἔχει τὸ ὄν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξ αὐτῆς γινομένων, ὅτι ἀληθὴς ἦν· ἐν δὲ τῇ αἰσθητῇ καὶ συνθέτῳ καὶ τὸ ὑποβεβλημένον ἄγονον καὶ οὐχ ἱκανὸν εἶναι ὄν, ὅτι μὴδὲ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἄλλα, σκιά δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ σκιᾷ αὐτῇ οὕση ζωγραφία καὶ σκιαγραφία". διόπερ ἐξ ἀνάγκης συμβαίνει μὴ πάντα ἐν τῷ εἶναι ὑπάρχειν ἐπὶ τῶν γινομένων μὴδὲ ἡμᾶς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς λαμβάνοντας δύνασθαι αἰεὶ τὰ κατ' οὐσίαν ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς περιλαμβάνειν.

²²⁵ Cf. e.g. S.K. Strange, "Plotinus, Porphyry and the Neoplatonic interpretation of the *Categories*", in: ANRW II 36.2, ed. W. Haase, Berlin/New York 1987, 955–974, who aims at downplaying the traditionally assumed shift in the interpretation of the *Categories* between Plotinus und Porphyry. Even further in this direction goes Thiel, *Kategorienschrift*, esp. 176–185, 196–201, 235–237.

²²⁶ Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 19,3–11; cf. *ibid.* 70,5–13. The unspecific use of

tence entirely depends (δεῖσθαι πρὸς ὑπαρξιν).²²⁷ However, as Cat. 2 does not determine any positive criteria for what exists by itself, the distinction rests entirely on the two criteria for the in-existing entity. If those two provide a clear and all-encompassing description of the accident, all the remaining entities will be substances. Hence, the commentators are fairly anxious to show that all other possible kinds of in-existence are actually distinguished from the accidental one by those two criteria, of course on the basis of the *Physics*-list mentioned above.

In his commentary on the passage in the *Categories*,²²⁸ Ammonius gives this list its final form by adding Dexippus' 'in time'²²⁹ and rejecting Porphyry's identification of the inherence of form in matter and accident in subject. Thus he gets eleven different ἐν τινι-relations with ὡς ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ οἷον τὸ συμβεβηκὸς ἐν οὐσίᾳ as a kind of its own,²³⁰ a number only Simplicius deviates from by adding ἐν τῷ κινούντι in order to achieve the even number of twelve kinds.²³¹ This list is understood as a comprehensive description of

αὐθυπόστατος for 'self-subsisting' instead of 'self-constituted' has—as far as I can see—no antecedents within the Neoplatonic tradition.

²²⁷ Cf. e.g. CAG IV/3, 25,19, Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 29,7–10: καὶ διὰ τί μὲν τὸ συμβεβηκὸς καλεῖ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ, δῆλον (αὐτὸ γὰρ καθ' αὐτὸ ὑποστῆναι οὐ δύναται, δέεται δὲ ἄλλου πρὸς ὑπαρξιν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐσίᾳς), τὴν δὲ οὐσίαν οὐκ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ (οὐ γὰρ δέεται ἐτέρου πρὸς ὑπαρξιν) or Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 44,28–45,1.

²²⁸ On the relationship of the five commentaries to be discussed here (Ammonius, Philoponus, Simplicius, Olympiodorus, Elias [David?]) cf. C. Luna in Simplicius, *Commentaire sur les Catégories*, fasc. III, Leiden a.o. 1990, 127–146, esp. the diagram on 146.

²²⁹ Cf. *In Cat.* I,21; CAG IV/2, 22,26–23,16.

²³⁰ *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 26,32–27,2. For a more explicit version cf. 29,5–17: Λέγεται δὲ τὸ ἐν τινι ἐνδεκαχῶς, ὡς ἤδη λέλεκται· ἐν χρόνῳ (ἐν τινι γὰρ χρόνῳ γεγόνεν ὁ Τρωϊκὸς πόλεμος ἢ ὁ Πελοποννησιακός), ἐν τόπῳ (λέγομεν γὰρ τὸν Σωκράτην ἐν τόπῳ εἶναι οἷον ἐν Λυκείῳ), ἐν ἀγγείῳ (λέγομεν γὰρ τὸν οἶνον ἐν τῷ κεράμῳ εἶναι· διαφέρει δὲ τὸ ἐν τόπῳ τοῦ ἐν ἀγγείῳ, διότι τὸ μὲν ἀγγεῖον τόπος ἐστὶ μεταφορητός, ὁ δὲ τόπος ἀγγεῖον ἀμεταφόρητον), ὡς μέρος ἐν ὅλῳ ὡς ὁ δάκτυλος ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἢ ἡ χεὶρ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ σώματι, ὡς ὅλον ἐν μέρεσιν (ὅλον γὰρ τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν φαμεν θεωρεῖσθαι ἐν τοῖς μέρεσιν καὶ οὐκ ἐν μέρει), ὡς εἶδος ἐν γένει ὡς ἀνθρώπος ἐν τῷ ζῳῳ, ὡς γένος ἐν εἴδει ὡς τὸ ζῷον ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, ὡς τὰ τῶν ἀρχομένων ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι (λέγομεν γὰρ ὅτι τόδε τὸ πράγμα ἐν τῷδε τῷ ἄρχοντι ἐστίν), ὡς εἶδος ἐν ὕλῃ ὡς τὸ ἀνθρώπινον εἶδος ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ ἢ τὸ τρίγωνον ἢ τετράγωνον σχῆμα ἐν τῷ χαλκῷ, ὡς ἐν τέλει ὡς (λέγομεν) τὴν ἱατρικὴν ἐν τῇ ὑγείᾳ, ὡς ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ ὡς τὸ συμβεβηκὸς ἐν οὐσίᾳ. Cf. Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 32,7–26 cf. *In Phys.*; CAG XVII, 526,26–527,1 / Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 46,5–14 cf. *In Phys.*; CAG IX, 551,15–552,17 / Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 47,2–21 / Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 149,16–33. Proclus' allusion in prop. 41 of the *Elements* (ed. Dodds, 44) only mentions three kinds (in subject, in efficient cause, in place). Cf. also Simplicius' explication of the difference between *Categories*- and *Physics*-list ab. n. 219.

²³¹ CAG VIII, 46,13f.21f. Following Aristotle's explication of 'in the ruler' as ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ κινητικῷ (*Physics* IV,3 210a22), Simplicius explains the 'in the ruler' in his *Physics*-commentary by the more general ἐν τῷ πρὸ τοῦ κινούντι καὶ ποιοῦντι (CAG IX, 552,8–12), Olympiodorus and his pupil Elias alter the ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι resp. κρατοῦντι to ἐν τῷ ποιητικῷ (CAG XII/1,

the genus ἐν τινι, to which Aristotle's two criteria have to be added as specific differences in order to get something like a proper definition of accidental inherence,²³² i.e. a description perfectly convertible with its descriptum.²³³

As this obviously cannot be shown without major terminological stipulation, there is a big variety in the commentators' handling of this problem: According to Ammonius the first criterion can only exclude the relationship part-whole, the other nine have to be ruled out by the second one.²³⁴ For Philoponus also the species can be considered as a part of the genus and thus also has to be excluded by the first criterion.²³⁵ Simplicius extends the first criterion also to 'genus in species' and 'form in matter', because the genus can be called a part of the definition of the species and the immattered form becomes a part of the composite entity.²³⁶ Olympiodorus never explicitly claims all the other ten kinds of ἐν τινι to be excluded by the two differences, but at first only gives the two examples of the eye excluded by the first, and the soul (in the body without being its part, but able to exist separately) excluded by the second difference.²³⁷ Elias finally adds two further criteria: The 'genus' ἐν τινι is to exclude the 'whole in parts' because of the latter's being rather ἐν τισιν, and the condition of ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν²³⁸ is to exclude the 'in place', because despite a substance's permanent being in a place it does not derive its existence from it.²³⁹ For all the commentators, the most troublesome point seems to be the exclusion of 'form in matter', which already Porphyry and Jamblichus—in their opinion following

47,17 f.; XVIII/1, 149,29–31). Cf. Philoponus, *In Phys.*; CAG XVII, 529,7–10: ἔτι ὡς ἐν βασιλεῖ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ δλωσ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ κινητικῷ· ὁ γὰρ ἄρχων ποιητικὸν αἰτιὸν ἐστι τῶν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων. καὶ "Ομηρος "Διὸς δ' ἐν γούνασι κεῖται", καὶ ἡ συνήθεια· πολλὰκις γὰρ φαμεν ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι εἶναι τὸ ζῆν καὶ ἀποθανεῖν. Hence, Simplicius distinguishes 'in the mover' from 'in the ruler' in his commentary on the *Categories* probably just in order to avoid the odd number eleven.

²³² Olympiodorus is the most careful here in emphasizing that Aristotle did not give a ὁρισμός, but only a ὑπογραφή. Cf. *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 46,28–47,2 (including a eulogizing apology for Aristotle and a philosophical justification: ὁμῶνυμος γὰρ ἐστὶ φωνὴ τὸ ἐν τινι, τῶν δὲ ὁμῶνυμων ὁρισμὸν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποδοῦναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὑπογραφῆν).

²³³ Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 26,30–32 (Yet, in defending its convertibility he omits the ἀνάλογον and speaks of a ὁρισμός without qualification [27,9]).

²³⁴ Ibid. 27,3–8.

²³⁵ CAG XIII/1, 32,29–33,5.

²³⁶ CAG VIII, 47,11–24.

²³⁷ CAG XII/1, 47,25–33. Because of a lacuna in the text, this is probably only an incomplete account of Olympiodorus' position.

²³⁸ CAG XVIII/1, 149,4–15; 150,15–29. This corresponds to Plotinus' or Jamblichus' third criterion (cf. *bel. n.* 268).

²³⁹ Ibid., 151,8–13.

the *Physics*—had identified with ‘accident in substance’.²⁴⁰ Elias at first participates in the attempt to distinguish the two relationships by the ‘not as a part’-criterion, but afterwards rejects this attempt—the form is not a part of matter, but of the composite—and claims the form to be an accident of matter, but part of the substance of the composite.²⁴¹ An ‘inversion’ of those arguments is finally presented by Simplicius, when he defends Aristotle’s category of ‘where?’ against Plotinus’ objection based on the ἐν τινι-list: ‘In place’ forms a category of its own, because this relation is neither reducible to inherence nor to ‘completion’ (συνπληροῦν, roughly identical with being a part), as the inexistent entity sustains its own nature and exists independently from place.²⁴²

In what follows, we will attempt a brief sketch of how the commentators tried to work out the differences between the inexistence of accidents, substantial parts (i.e. specific differences and substantial qualities) and species and genera in individuals, which will focus mainly on the terminological aspect and start from the objections against Aristotle’s definition of ‘being in a subject’, raised and refuted by the commentators.

3.3.3. *Inherence of Accidents*

The aporiai on these issues discussed by the commentators are grouped according to whether they could prove Aristotle’s ‘definition’ to be too wide or too narrow. The first group ‘originates’ in the objection concerning entities being in spaces (i.e. also substances as ‘in something else’),²⁴³ whereas the second group links up with the one about the sweet smell of an apple (a possibly separable accident).²⁴⁴ Examining the commentators’ discussion of those two groups of objections, the (in-)separability of accidents receives much more attention than the exact way of their inexistence, as in the case of sensible substances—which are exclusively capable of having accidents in the proper sense—the latter would be in most cases a problem of *Physics*. Nevertheless, also the logical commentaries offer some interesting remarks: In his refutation of the space-objection Ammonius resumes the distinction

²⁴⁰ Cf. ab. nn. 218 and 223.

²⁴¹ CAG XVIII/1, 150,28 f. cf. 151,25–34 and bel. n. 317.

²⁴² *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 349,5–350,9. Jamblichus obviously stuck a bit closer to the space-metaphor in calling ‘in a vessel’, ‘in matter’ and ‘in a subject’ τοπικαὶ σχέσεις, but those between wholes and parts and genera and species πρὸς τι σχέσεις (349,10–15).

²⁴³ Cf. Porphyry, *In Cat.* (CAG IV/1, 79,12–22); Dexippus, *In Cat.* I, 21 (CAG IV/2, 22,26–23,16); Boethius, *In Cat.* (MSL 62, 173AB).

²⁴⁴ CAG IV/1, 79,23–34; CAG IV/2, 25,8–21; MSL 62, 173B.

between accidents and concomitants already known from Plotinus.²⁴⁵ Space is a mere concomitant, no essential (or accidental) part of the substance. The latter must not be said to in-subsist in space, but only to exist in it:

Otherwise [i.e. if the “in space” would signify an inherence of the substance] the ‘in’ had to be attached to the ‘existing’ in order to get ‘insubsisting in something’. Yet, we do not claim the substance to insubsist in space, but just to exist. The former we say exclusively about the accidents, namely the ‘insubsisting’.²⁴⁶

Here ἐνυπάρχειν is unequivocally claimed to be the technical term for accidental inherence. However, the majority of Ammonius’ pupils seem to have regarded this claim as mere stipulation. None of them except Simplicius accepts this aspect of his solution, but only the distinction between συμβεβηκός and παρακολούθημα.²⁴⁷ Philoponus may have this distinction in mind, when he postulates for an accident that it has to penetrate the whole substance,²⁴⁸ whereas Ammonius subdivides—admittedly not in an ontological, but in a doxographical context—the accidents in fully-penetrating and superficial ones.²⁴⁹ This kind of internal characterization of inexistence originated in the discussion of quality, which is described in extenso by Simplicius²⁵⁰ and cannot be discussed in detail in the present context. Only one point deserves attention: Although Simplicius wants to maintain the

²⁴⁵ Cf. esp. VI 3 (44), 3.

²⁴⁶ CAG IV/4, 27,27–30: ἄλλως τε τὸ ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχον συντακτέον, ἵνα ἢ ‘ὁ τι ἐνυπάρχον’, ἐνυπάρχειν δὲ ἐν τόπῳ τὴν οὐσίαν οὐ φαμεν, ἀλλ’ ὑπάρχειν· ἐκεῖνο γὰρ ἐπὶ μόνων τῶν συμβεβηκῶν φαμέν, τὸ ἐνυπάρχειν φημί. However, this does not match with Ammonius’ own usage in his commentary on *De interpretatione*, where he just adapts to the imprecise terminology of the text he comments (cf. esp. on *De int.* 11 21a17–32; CAG IV/5,211 f.).

²⁴⁷ CAG VIII, 50,9–11; cf. Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 33,10–31. Olympiodorus (CAG XII/1, 48,13–19) only provides a more sophisticated version of Porphyry’s solution from Themistius’ lost paraphrase (Simplicius ascribes a very similar account to Boethus of Sidon: CAG VIII, 49,31–50,9) and Elias adds to this common solution his fourth criterion (cf. ab. n. 238).

²⁴⁸ *In Phys.*; CAG XVII, 535,21–23: εἰ γὰρ μὴ δι’ ὅλου ἐχώρησεν, ἀλλ’ ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα, οὐκέτι ὡς συμβεβηκός ὑπάρχει αὐτῷ.

²⁴⁹ *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 40,17–41,2: The ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ὑφ’ ἐστῶτα ἀσώματα are the accidents (the white of white-leaded paint as example for the first group, the shape of a bowl for the second one), the περὶ τὰ ὑφ’ ἐστῶτα are the external circumstances. In Simplicius’ systematization of the categories (*In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 67,26–68,13) the difference between internal accident and external circumstance is represented by the distinction of non-relational (quality, quantity) and relational (relation, where, when ...) accidents. In the following report of Jamblichus’ account of the same question, accidents are divided into συνυπάρχοντα τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ (quality, quantity) and περὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον θεωρούμενα (Ibid., 68,16–21). Cf. also Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 49,16–19.

²⁵⁰ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 208,22–219,35.

accidental dependence of qualities on their subjects, his Platonism does not allow them to be just abstractions from qualified entities. They completely belong to their material substrates, are by no means outside of it, but nevertheless have a reality on their own (καθ' ἑαυτοῦς ὑπόστασις) with regard to matter and insubstist in bodies 'with a certain distance' or perhaps recoil [from complete dissolution into matter] (ὥσπερ ἀφ'esτῶτες).²⁵¹ Yet, as those views do not originate from a consideration of inexistence in general, but rather of the ontological status of qualities in particular, we will leave those aside and take a look at the second group of objections against Aristotle's 'definition' and the treatment of possibly separable accidents.

Regarding the inseparability of accidents, there was a more extensive discussion also in logical contexts: Whereas Aristotle had described the accident from its own perspective as inseparable, Porphyry's *Isagoge* (ch. 5) had added the complementary view from the perspective of the subject defining the accident as "appearing and disappearing without corruption of the subject". The main difference between accident and subject would be then that the subject has to survive an at least conceptual²⁵² separation, whereas the accident must not. In Ammonius, the criterion of conceptual separability seems to advance to the main demarcation line between the substantial and the accidental realm.²⁵³ In justification of Porphyry's treatment of the property immediately after the specific difference he says:

²⁵¹ Ibid., 209,30–211,4. 211,35–212,11. 218,5–219,35. The Jamblichean origin of this theory is proven by 289,16–34.

²⁵² Cf. Porphyry on the 'inseparable accident' (*Isagog.*; CAG IV/1, 12,26–13,3): τὸ μὲν οὖν καθ'ἑαυτὸν χωριστὸν συμβεβηκός, τὸ δὲ μέλαν εἶναι ἀχωρίστως τῷ κόρακι καὶ τῷ Αἰθίοπι συμβεβηκεν, δύναται δὲ ἐπινοηθῆναι καὶ κόραξ λευκός καὶ Αἰθίοψ ἀποβαλὼν τὴν χροῖαν χωρὶς φθορᾶς τοῦ ὑποκειμένου.

²⁵³ Cf. *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 33,11–16; 94,12–20; 109,3–7; 111,2–18; 114,3–7 / Elias, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/1, 77,24–34 / David, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/2, 205,20–28 / Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 66,36–67,1; 126,6–8 [which presupposes the equation of substantial and physical affective qualities expounded below]. The notion of conceptual separability is notoriously ambiguous. Traditionally connected with Aristotle's account of mathematical objects (Cf. Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 11,30–12,6), it is usually illustrated by the term-pair 'snub-nosed', which is conceptually inseparable from matter, and 'concave', which can be conceptually separated from and defined without respect to matter (cf. *De anima* III,7 / *Metaphysics* VI,1 [differently in VII,1] / *Physics* II,2 and Asclepius, *In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 360,31–362,28 / Philoponus, *In De anima*; CAG XV, 55,23–64,17). In this sense, it can only be the substance which is conceptually separable from, i.e. definable without reference to those 'separable' or 'inseparable' accidents. What the commentators have in mind is, however, the act of conceptual separation, not—as in case of the mathematical objects—the possibility of separate existence in thought. Nevertheless, conceptual separability is not really a useful criterion in order to distinguish which features are substantial and which are not, as it presupposes the set of attributes included in a definition rather than helping to find it, resp. to deter-

Having treated the substantial aspects, he necessarily speaks about the non-substantial ones. Yet, he starts with the property as being the frontier between the two, as it communicates with the substantial ones in that the real property applies to its proprietors exclusively, in any case and always just like the substantial aspects (for also those apply always and to every one of the entities to which they belong), and it communicates with the accidents, as just as they are separated conceptually from their subject, also the property is conceptually separated.²⁵⁴

Yet, for the commentators all this not only entails that there must not be an accident destroying its proper subject,²⁵⁵ but also causes difficulties with any kind of influence a substance exerts over a spatial or even (esp. in the case of smell) temporal distance, like the aforesaid sweet smell of an apple.²⁵⁶ Is it possible for an accident to change subjects, as Porphyry had suggested for the smell,²⁵⁷ e.g. from 'apple' to 'air'? If so, the accident would at least be separable from its original subject and thus not completely inseparable. Although this was apparently accepted by Ammonius and Philoponus as at least an alternative solution,²⁵⁸ it is harshly rejected by Olympiodorus, Simplicius and Elias: No accident can exist without its own proper subject, no matter what kind of physical explanation we exactly give for the evaporation of smell.²⁵⁹ The reason for this has in my opinion

mine which quality of the entity in question is substantial. Simplicius' proposal to invert the mental experiment and to ask, of which quality we cannot think without introducing also a substance (πεζόν in contrast to λευκόν; *In Cat.* CAG VIII, 103,26–104,5) could be substantiated by his argument against the possibility of substantial colours (255,17–256,15; also the standard example 'white of snow' excluded!), but is again invalidated by his claim that in principal every quality can be substantial, e.g. 'white' in 'white lead' (ψιμύθιον; *ibid.* 276,34–277,1).

²⁵⁴ *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 109,1–7: διαλεχθεῖς γὰρ περὶ τῶν οὐσιωδῶν, ἀναγκαίως καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐπουσιωδῶν διαλέγεται. ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἄρχεται ὡς μεταίχιμίου ὄντος· κοινωνεῖ γὰρ καὶ τοῖς οὐσιώδεσι, καθὼς μόνῳ καὶ παντὶ καὶ αἰεὶ ὑπάρχει τὸ κυρίως ἴδιον, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ οὐσιώδη (καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ πᾶσι καὶ αἰεὶ ὑπάρχει, οἷς ὑπάρχει), κοινωνεῖ δὲ καὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνα τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ χωρίζεται τοῦ ὑποκειμένου, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ χωρίζεται.

²⁵⁵ If fever kills a human being, it destroys the qualitative complexion of its juices, not the organic bodily substance, its proper subject (Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 111,18–113,25 / Elias, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/1, 92,6–23 / David, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/2, 206,17–34).

²⁵⁶ Cf. Thiel, *Kategorienschrift*, 90–95 and 259–262.

²⁵⁷ Cf. CAG IV/1, 79,12–34.

²⁵⁸ Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 28,8–29,4 / Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII, 35,16–36,13.

²⁵⁹ Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 48,32–49,23 / Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 49,10–30 / Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 152,5–153,2. What Olympiodorus and his pupil Elias offer as Plotinus' solution seems at first sight identical with the subject-transfer from apple to air, but is explained by Elias in a way which makes it possible to exclude this interpretation also for his master (who thinks this solution to be more plausible than the Peripatetic one, which postulates a smell-transport by small pieces of evaporating apple-substance): κατ' οὐδεμίαν δὲ τῶν δοξῶν αἱ ποιότητες ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκείμενον μεταβαίνουσιν

to be sought in the commentators' attitude towards the individuation of accidents. The frequently discussed question, what the individual accident of Cat. 2 is, was unanimously answered by the commentators: It is the accident of an individual substance. The *τις γραμματική* only subsists in a *τις γραμματικός*, e.g. Aristarch, and thus necessarily has to perish *qua τις* when separated from this individual.²⁶⁰

To summarize this paragraph, accidental inherence can be specified according to the commentators as a relationship which is non-essential and factual as to the subject, but essential and necessary as to the accident, which occurs between two numerically determined entities and is restricted to sensible individuals.

3.3.4. *Inherence of Substantial Parts* (*Specific Differences, Substantial Qualities*)

The discussion of substantial parts, especially formal ones (parts of the definition), as a species of the genus *ἐν τινι* or *μὴ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὑφ'εσθηκέναι*²⁶¹ clearly marks the 'ontological shift' between Aristotle and his commentators in understanding the *Categories*. Whereas Aristotle had made it absolutely clear that genera, species and differences are said of a subject and do not inhere in it (Cat. 5 329–32), the commentators (at least in their discussion of Cat. 2) basically distinguish between self-subsisting substances on the one hand and eleven kinds of different inexistent entities on the other. Probably they felt free to do so because Aristotle had already made the implicit concession that we do speak of substantial parts as being *in* their wholes, but obviously not as in their subject according to the definition of Cat. 2.²⁶²

(CAG XVIII/1, 152,30 f.). More explicitly Simplicius (CAG VIII, 49,18–22): *καὶ πῶς ποιότης ἐκτὸς οὐσίας μεταβήσεται; ἔσται γὰρ οὕτως χωριστὴ τὴν φύσιν, κὰν ἐν ἄλλῃ γίνεταί μεταβαίνουσα. μήποτε οὖν ἄμεινον λέγειν ὅτι πᾶσα μὲν εὐωδία καὶ πᾶν τοιοῦτον συμβεβηκὸς μετὰ τῆς οἰκείας οὐσίας ἔστιν καὶ οὐδέποτε ταύτης ἀποσπᾶται.* A. Busse (CAG XVIII/1, note on 152,10) wants to find "Plotinus" solution in *Ennead* IV 5,1f. and 6,2. Yet, the former text argues against the necessity of a medium like air or light for visual perception, and the latter rejects the materialistic conception of sense perception as an impression of the object in the soul. The best possible reference would be in my opinion IV 4,29, where Plotinus proposes, but afterwards rejects the hypothesis, that qualities like sweet smell (*εὐωδία*) could be transferred to other, invisible bodies as their subjects after the destruction of their first subject.

²⁶⁰ Simplicius (*In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 102,28–103,4) explains this by the fact, that individuals must be capable *δεξις*, which capability can only be communicated to accidents by self-subsisting substances. On this problem in general cf. the extensive treatment of Thiel, *Kategorienschrift*, 95–124.

²⁶¹ Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 34,6 f.

²⁶² Cat. 5 329–32: *μὴ ταρραττέτω δὲ ἡμᾶς τὰ μέρη τῶν οὐσιῶν ὡς ἐν ὑποκειμένοις ὄντα τοῖς ὅλοις,*

Thus, the ‘not as a part’ criterion separates accidental inherence from both the inexistence of substantial qualities and specific differences and from that of genera and species, as both make up the definition of a substance as their parts.²⁶³ This part of our survey will thus treat primarily the rapport between specific differences or substantial qualities and accidents, whereas the next paragraph will concentrate on the problem of the ontological status of universals (genera and species) and their instantiation in individuals.

Concerning the ontological status of the specific differences, there were two conflicting tendencies: Porphyry had tried to assign an intermediate ontological status to it, as it is both constitutive part of a substance (συμπληρωτικόν) and thus ‘substantial’ (οὐσιώδης),²⁶⁴ and qualifies this substance in a specific manner and is thus quality, as it is incapable of receiving opposite qualifications, which is the core criterion for substantiality according to Cat. 5 4a10 f.²⁶⁵ Despite the authorities of both Alexander, who had clearly rejected the latter argument,²⁶⁶ and Plotinus, who in his early treatise II 6 (17) had drawn a clear-cut division between ‘completing energies’ and external qualities of a substance,²⁶⁷ this train of thought is followed by Dexippus

μή ποτε ἀναγκασθῶμεν οὐκ οὐσίας αὐτὰ φάσκειν εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ οὕτω τὰ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ ἐλέγετο τὰ ὡς μέρη ὑπάρχοντα ἐν τινι.

²⁶³ Aristotle could even treat the differentia as practically identical with the specific form of an entity. Cf. e.g. *Metaphysics* VII,12 1037b27–1038a20; *De partibus animalium* 643a24 and also Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 97,28–30.

²⁶⁴ *In Cat.*; CAG IV/1, 95,22–28,31–35.

²⁶⁵ *In Cat.*; CAG IV/1, 99,3–13. The term ‘substantial quality’ goes back to Aristotle himself who called the difference κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ποιότης in *Metaphysics* V,14 1020b1. Cf. ibid. 1020b14 f. (πρώτη ποιότης τῆς οὐσίας); XI,12 1068b18 f.; *Physics* V,2 226a27 f. (τὸ ποῖον τὸ ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ) and Cat. 5 3b20 (about the genus and the species, which is often identified with the differentia [e.g. *Metaphysics* VII,12 1038b19–21]: περὶ οὐσίαν τὸ ποῖον ἀφορίζει). For the discussion in the *Topics* see Wurm, Substanz, 122 with n. 102. The passage he quotes from *Topics* VII,3 153a17 f. does not classify the differentia as substance, but makes clear that the question τί ἐστὶν has to be answered by genus and differentia. In the Meiner-edition (*Topik. Sophistische Widerlegungsschlüsse*, Hamburg 1997, 367) H.G. Zekl correctly translates: “wenn aber bei dieser Frage nach dem Wesen die Gattung und die artbildenden Unterschiede ausgesagt werden.” According to *Topics* IV,6 128a20–29, the differentia was assigned to the category of substance by some philosophers, but has to be regarded as a quality.

²⁶⁶ Cf. A. Dietrich, “Die arabische Version einer unbekannten Schrift des Alexander von Aphrodisias über die differentia specifica”, in: *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 1964, (88–148) 128 (§ 11) and 142 (§ 12). He argues that the criterion in question only applies to individual, not to general substances, such as genera and specific differences.

²⁶⁷ Cf. esp. II 6, 18 f. Plotinus’ most important statements on the problem are collected in Sorabji, *Sourcebook* III, 117–119. On the possible contradiction between II 6 and VI 2,14 cf. A.C. Lloyd, *The Anatomy of Neoplatonism*, Oxford 1990, 88–95.

(*In Cat.* II, 20–22),²⁶⁸ who reports on three different views concerning the specific difference, one considering it as (substantial) *quality*, another one positing it between quality and substance, and a final one clearly regarding it as part of the substance equal to the genus.²⁶⁹ Although he does not commit himself with absolute certainty, his own introductory remark to II,21 clearly shows sympathies with the second solution: In the process of substantial change, he says, there must be a hidden factor mediating e.g. between the potential non-human and the actual human—an opposition of extremes which are both mutually exclusive and incapable of graduation. Thus, the specific difference might be an analogous mysterious mean between substantial being and (accidental) qualified being such and such.²⁷⁰

Yet, neither Porphyry nor Dexippus seem to have convinced the later commentators. According to them, “completing” (συμπληροῦν) parts of a substance first of all have to be substances themselves,²⁷¹ as otherwise both Aristotle’s affirmation of the substantiality of parts (also *Cat.* 7 8b15–19) and the sufficiency of his basic ontological distinction between substances and accidents would be called into question. The commentators, however, are by all means willing to maintain the substance-accidents-scheme, which is considered to be an at any rate all-embracing ἀντίφασις (not in a subject / in a subject), and to avoid the introduction of an eleventh category.²⁷²

²⁶⁸ In II,21, he criticizes the Aristotelian definition of accidental inherence as being too unspecific with regard to both species and differences (CAG IV/2, 49,6–8): διὸ δεῖ προστιθέναι εἰς τὸν ὅρον τοῦ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ τὸ οὐδὲν συντελούντος εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ ὑποκειμένου· τὸ γὰρ εἶδος συντελεῖ τι καὶ ἡ διαφορά. The source for this third criterion is probably Plotinus, *Ennead* VI 3 (44), 5,7–13: Καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ εἶναι κατὰ πάσης οὐσίας, εἰ τὸ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ εἶναι δεῖ μὴ ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχειν τοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶ, μὴδ’ οὕτως, ὥστε μὴδὲ συντελεῖν μετ’ ἐκείνου εἰς ἓν τι· μεθ’ οὗ γὰρ συντελεῖ εἰς σύνθετον οὐσίαν, ἐν ἐκείνῳ ὡς ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ οὐκ ἂν εἴη· ὥστε μῆτε τὸ εἶδος ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ εἶναι ὡς ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ μῆτε τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐν τῷ Σωκράτει μέρος ὄντα Σωκράτους. According to Simplicius (*In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 99,6–9), it was explicitly postulated also by Jamblichus, Dexippus’ teacher.

²⁶⁹ *In Cat.* II,21 (CAG IV/2, 49,8–25).

²⁷⁰ *In Cat.* II,21 (CAG IV/2, 48,27–49,6): δοκεῖ δὴ τοῖς δεινοῖς περὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἱστορίαν ἄρρητος γίνεσθαι ἡ τῆς φύσεως ἀφ’ ἐτέρου γένους εἰς ἕτερον γένος μετάβασις αἰεὶ τοῦ μέσου διαλασθάνοντος ἡμᾶς, οἷον τὸ δυνάμει τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐσιῶν, οἷον λέγω ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἢ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ἐν τοῖς σπέρμασι θεωρούμενον, οὔτε οὐσία οὐδέπω ἐστίν (ἐτι γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀτελής) οὔτε τὸ ἐνεργεῖα τῷ οὕτως δυνάμει συμβέβηκε (τελείότης γὰρ τοῦτο)· λείπεται τοίνυν μέσον τι ἄλλο εἶναι τῶν οὐσιῶν τοῦ τε ἐνεργεῖα φέρε ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ δυνάμει. ὁ αὐτὸς τοίνυν ἐστὶ λόγος καὶ περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη τὸ μέσον ἔξει ποιότητός τε καὶ οὐσίας· διὸ καὶ συντελεῖ εἰς τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ ποῖόν εἶναι, καὶ οὕτως ἔσται οὐκ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ.

²⁷¹ E.g. Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 79,20. 80,2–5.10 f. 84,17–19. 85,1–5. 88,1–4 a.m.

²⁷² Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 46,17–19/Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 66,7–25/Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 67,32–35. 70,27–71,6/Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 173,35–174,14/Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 49,5–9 and already Alexander, *De differentia specifica*

Nevertheless, they also allow for treating the specific difference as a quality, mainly in considering the respective properties ontologically by themselves without respect to their function within a species.²⁷³ Thus, Ammonius, Philoponus and Elias present a distinction between three types of differences: one closer to substances (the *differentiae specificae*), one right between substances and qualities (the four elementary qualities) and one closer to qualities (the inseparable accidents).²⁷⁴ As this distinction most probably goes back to Porphyry's lost major commentary, it would have been very interesting to see how he related it to the different kinds of qualities presented by Aristotle in Cat. 8. Most of the later commentators found the substantial ones in those *παθητικαὶ ποιότητες* which rather cause the affection in our senses than result from affections of their subjects themselves (warmth of the fire, sweetness of honey) and are "like the form and the substance in their subject".²⁷⁵ This claim is based on a complicated systematization of Aristotle's types of quality presented most extensively in Philoponus: Firstly, qualities are divided into actual and potential ones and the latter identified with Aristotle's (in-)capabilities (Cat. 8 9a14–27). Secondly, the actual qualities are subdivided into completing (*τελειωτικά*) or corrupting (*κακωτικά*) ones and neither completing nor corrupting ones. The former are again divided into those which affect our sense-perception and those which do not, the latter into penetrating and superficial ones. The last group are Aristotle's shapes and forms (Cat. 8 10a11–26). Habits and dispositions (Cat. 8 8b26–9a13) only occur in living creatures and have to be identified with the non-sensible completing or corrupting qualities, which can either be enduring (habits) or momentaneous (dispositions). The affective qualities and affections (Cat. 8 9a28–10a10) comprise in fact three different groups which are spread over the different branches of the scheme: the affective qualities which are characterized by affecting

§ 2 (ed. Dietrich, 122 and 138). A tripartition of substance (genus, species)—substantial quality (difference)—accidents is nevertheless (perhaps due to some Stoic influence concerning the distinction between *(ὁ)ποιόν* and *πῶς ἔχον*) insinuated by some passages of Ammonius' *Isagoge*-commentary (cf. CAG IV/3, 62,19–23; 64,15–23; also 109,1–7. 121,9 f. [the *proprium* as *μεταίχμιον* between the substantial and the accidental] and perhaps Simplicius' explanation of *ὅποιόν τι* *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 55,5–12).

²⁷³ Simplicius' most important statements on this are expounded by Thiel, *Kategorien-schrift*, 267–272.

²⁷⁴ Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 46,11–17 / Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 64,22–66,5 / Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 173,13–35. The latter explicitly attributes the theory to Porphyry. Dexippus' and Simplicius' (*In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 98,6–30) accounts make it plausible that he at least provided the inspiration for it in his commentary ad *Gedaliūm*.

²⁷⁵ Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 86,18.

our sense-perception rather than by themselves originating in an affection of their subject (heat of fire, sweetness of honey), the affective qualities which—although they also affect our sense-perception—rather bear that name because of being caused by an affection of their subject (esp. colours), and actual affections which are enduring enough to count as a quality. The latter two form the class of neither completing nor corrupting, but penetrating qualities; the former are claimed to be our substantial qualities: completing or corrupting ones which affect our sense perception.²⁷⁶ The reason for this identification is clear: If a property does not originate in any affection of its subject, it has to be there by nature and always.²⁷⁷ But this is not the difference between the two types of affective qualities envisaged by Aristotle. His point is, as Simplicius rightly affirms, that one class communicates its very own quality, whereas the other does not: The warmth of the fire really makes our bodies warm, whereas the white of snow does not make our eyes white.²⁷⁸ This criterion is of course not only useless for distinguishing substantial qualities from non-substantial ones, but does not fit the most well-known specific differences like ‘rationality’ either. Despite Philoponus’ further attempts of justification²⁷⁹—he even postulates ‘qualities’ of the soul

²⁷⁶ Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 134, 13–138, 31 cf. Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 82, 2–83, 2 / Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 115, 18–117, 16 (several alternative ways of division discussed, but basically the same criteria of division). Elias’ description of the four genera (*In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 222, 15–223, 38) also employs the criteria mentioned above and results in a division which is only slightly different (ibid. 224, 1–11). Simplicius’ division (CAG VIII, 228, 15–35) omits the criterion *τελειωτική / κακωτική* probably not by chance. This criterion might originate in Proclan influence (cf. *In Platonis Parmenidem commentaria*, ed. C. Steel/C. Mace/P. d’Hoine, vol. 1, Oxford 2007, 239 [826, 35–37 C.]), whose strict dismissal of intelligible paradigms for accidents demands such a kind of material differentiation between qualities which are in themselves capable of completing a substance and those which are not.

²⁷⁷ Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 149, 14–18: αὐτάς δὲ μὴ κατὰ πάθος ἐγγενέσθαι, οἷς ἂν ὑπάρχωσιν, ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός· οὐ γὰρ κατὰ πάθος ἐγγέγονε τῷ πυρὶ ἡ θερμότης· οὐσιωδῶς γὰρ ὑπάρχει αὐτῷ καὶ εἰδοποιὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ μέλιτος γλυκύτητος ἔχει ἡ τῆς ἐν χιόνι λευκότητος καὶ τῶν τοιούτων. Cf. also Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 115, 24 f.

²⁷⁸ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 254, 34–255, 12.

²⁷⁹ In his exposition of Aristotle’s third group of qualities, he divides the affective qualities into those characterizing the whole species and those which do not, and subdivides the first group into those which do not complete the subject, i.e. those the removal of which would not destroy it (*In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 147, 15–17 cf. 136, 1–9 / Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 49, 26–30 / Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 115, 35–116, 14) and those which do. In identifying the last group with those ‘rather affecting our sense-perception than being caused by an affection themselves’ he proceeds the opposite way and determines his obscure group of affective qualities by a common ontological concept of substantial qualities (CAG XIII/1, 147, 9–148, 7). This identification ergo does not contribute anything to a material determination of what kinds of quality are substantial, but ends up in a mere tautology.

metaphorically ‘affecting’ the divine perception²⁸⁰—Simplicius is therefore right in dismissing this solution on the grounds that substances and their (formal) parts are inaccessible for sense-perception, which excludes the latter’s being affective qualities.²⁸¹ As part of the form, the difference subsists in the individual like form in matter, not like an accident in a subject.²⁸²

Nevertheless, Simplicius also offers a deeper metaphysical explanation for the qualitative aspect of the difference: Applying a very common tool of Neoplatonic metaphysics, he postulates a participation-link between the ten categories, allowing both substantial traits for qualities and qualitative traits for substances. Thus, quality communicates its property of characterizing an entity (ἀφορίζειν τὸν χαρακτήρα) to each category. On the level of substance, this property can appear as substantial difference or species without entailing an attribution of those two to the category of quality or any kind of intermediate category.²⁸³ Accordingly, substantial properties can also be found in the category of quality, especially in shapes and virtues which are not capable of being graduated.²⁸⁴ Hence, it is easily understood why Simplicius can treat differentiae both as substances and qualities, especially when he claims them to be the reason for a possible opposition of substances²⁸⁵ and when he blames their ‘concurrent quality-aspect’ for their occasionally varying degrees.²⁸⁶

²⁸⁰ Ibid. 148,8–149,3. The absurdity of this argument involves him into a self-contradiction: He had argued in 135,30–136,9 that τελειωτικαί and κακωτικαί ποιότητες only come to be and pass away together with (i.e. are substantial in) anorganic subjects and thus do not have to be divided into δυσάποβληταί and εύάποβληταί. Equally absurd is Ammonius’ claim (*In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 83,3–23) that ἀλλοίωσις (qualitative change) only happens with respect to affective qualities, which would entail the substantiality of the other three types. The passage in Aristotle about the change of habits his claim is based on, *Physics* V,2 226a27–29, is notoriously ambiguous (cf. the introduction of H.G. Zekl, *Aristoteles’ Physik. Bücher V (E)–VIII* (Θ), Hamburg 1988 [PhB 381], XXIX–XXXI) and probably does not use τὸ ποῖόν τὸ παθητικόν in the sense of Cat. 8, but in the more general sense of ‘qualification due to affection’.

²⁸¹ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 254,3–17. Simplicius almost entirely abandons the very popular problem of substantial qualities in his treatment of quality and mentions it only briefly in his historical survey (*In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 209,7–10; a passage unfortunately distorted by a lacuna) without resuming it anywhere later on. The differentiae occur several times in the chapter, but consistently as parts of the substance (cf. e.g. 223,31–224,11. 257,31–258,14. 263,16–19. 270,11–14).

²⁸² *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 94,37–95,1.

²⁸³ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 270,32–271,5. However, 276,6–20 implies the alternative (more Proclan) concept of explaining the genus-species-division of all ten categories by their participation in ταυτότης and ἐτερότης.

²⁸⁴ Ibid. 286,13–15; 288,34–289,13.

²⁸⁵ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 107,5–30.

²⁸⁶ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 112,15–31.

If the specific difference can thus always be regarded both as quality and as substantial part, the only way to specify how its inherence receives its distinctive, completing character will probably be a reference to the intelligible paradigm the respective sensible substance tries to imitate. In this case, the crucial point for the substantial or accidental character of a certain quality would not be the way of its inherence, but its relevance for qualifying a certain individual as the likeness of a certain idea.

3.3.5. *Inherence of Genera and Species*

In the case of genus and species it is obvious that they are inseparable, constitutive (formal, definitory) parts or elements of an entity²⁸⁷ and thus most unlikely to be confused with accidents. Small wonder that Simplicius can easily provide five arguments why secondary substances are not in a subject:²⁸⁸

- (1) Secondary substances are, if anything, predicated of a subject.
- (2) An individual man can never exist without being man, i.e. is completed by the secondary substance 'man'.
- (3) Against the Porphyrian definition of the accident, genera or species cannot be absent without corruption of the individual.
- (4) Secondary substances would either inhere in their own individuals or in something else. The former is impossible because of reason (1) and the latter because there are no other subjects apart from individuals.
- (5) According to Aristotle everything inherent is predicated homonymously, yet secondary substances are always predicated synonymously.

Nevertheless, Porphyry did not trouble just western Medieval philosophers with the famous question from his *Isagoge*, whether they exist καθ' αὐτό or ἐν ἑτέροις,²⁸⁹ but already his Greek successors, who responded to the question with their equally well-known and problematic theory of a threefold universal:²⁹⁰ the transcendent cause of the sensible individuals of a species

²⁸⁷ Cf. Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 67,32–34 / Asclepius, *In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 440,3–12.

²⁸⁸ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 93,32–94,23.

²⁸⁹ CAG IV/3, 40,15–17.

²⁹⁰ Cf. A.C. Lloyd, "Neoplatonic logic and Aristotelian logic", in: *Phronesis* 1 (1956), (8–72.146–159) 59–64; Id., *Anatomy*, 62–75 / K. Kremer, *Der Metaphysikbegriff in den Aristoteleskommentaren der Ammonius-Schule*, Münster 1960, 153–155, esp. the references on 153 n. 85; Id., "Die Anschauung der Ammonius (Hermeiou)-Schule über den Wirklichkeitscharakter des Intelligiblen. Über einen Beitrag der Spätantike zur platonisch-aristotelischen

(universale ante res), the immanent community between those individuals holding the species together (in rebus) and the concept in the human mind abstracting this community from the accidental properties distinguishing those individuals (post res).²⁹¹ When Ammonius simply (and on the background of Christological discussion astonishingly) ascribes to every genus both a distinct hypostasis which is καθ' αὐτὸ θεωρούμενον and several other hypostases it has *in* its species,²⁹² he probably refers the former to this genus as transcendent cause and the latter to this genus as immanent community. However, in what sense can this community still said to be universal or common? Does not a species participating in different genera just as different

Metaphysik", in: *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 69 (1961/62), (46–63) 62 / L. Benakis, "The Problem of General Concepts in Neoplatonism and Byzantine Thought", in: *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, ed. D.J. O'Meara, Albany 1982, (75–86) 83–85 and R. Cross, "Gregory of Nyssa on Universals", in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 56 (2002), (372–410) 374–380. The latest interpretation was proposed by Thiel, *Kategorienschrift*, 30–58 and 235–242, who to a certain extent intends a 'demetaphysication' of the theory by connecting the ante res-universal with the undetermined preconception described in Philoponus' commentary on *Physics* I,1 184a16 ff. Another attempt of clarification is Sorabji's distinction of at least seven kinds of universals in differentiating two kinds of ante res- and three kinds of post res-ones (cf. his *Sourcebook* III, 133–147). A new orientation for the entire discussion can be expected from J. Zachhuber, "Universals in the Greek Church Fathers", in: *Universals in ancient thought*, ed. R. Chiaradonna/G. Galluzzo, Pisa 2012 (forthcoming).

²⁹¹ Cf. also Proclus' commentary on the Parmenides (ed. Steel/Mace/d'Hoine, vol. 2, Oxford 2008, 61 f. [884,8–26 C.]) where he presents a peculiar interpretation of the ring-wax-simile this doctrine is illustrated by in the commentators (Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 41,10–20 / David, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/2, 113,11–29): In the act of someone's soul deciding to create an imprint in some piece of wax with a signet-ring on his finger, the wax corresponds to matter, the imprint to the immattered form, the signet-ring to the logos of nature, the hand to the logos of soul and the ring-wearer's soul to the idea in the intellect. In his commentary on Euclid's *Elements*, he describes the ontological status of mathematical objects according to Plato based on a general resumption of this distinction (*In primum Euclidis elementorum librum commentarii*, ed. G. Friedlein, Leipzig 2^a 1873 [repr. Hildesheim 1992], 50,18–51,9) and explains those as a subspecies of the in-rebus-universal, as the general entity may subsist both in sensible and 'phantastical' matter, the imaginary power of the human mind (ibid., 51,9–54,13).

²⁹² *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 27,23–28,5: Φαμέν οὖν ὅτι ἀληθές μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ τὰ ἐπ' ἑλκτον τῶν ἐπὶ πλέον κατηγορεῖσθαι, τὸ μέντοι δὴν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπὶ πλέον τοῦ ἀναγκαίου. κυρίως γὰρ ἐκεῖνα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πλέον ὀνόματα, ὅσα κατὰ πολλῶν κατηγορούμενα καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς ἔχοντα ὑπόστασιν καὶ ἐν τι πράγμα ἐστὶ ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν ἔχον αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ θεωρούμενον ὡς τὸ ζῶον· κατηγορεῖται γὰρ κατὰ κυνὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἵππου, καὶ ἔχει μὲν ἐν τούτοις ὑπόστασιν, καὶ ἰδίαν ἅλιν ἔχει οὐσίαν αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ θεωρούμενον τε καὶ νοούμενον (ὀριζόμεθα οὖν τὸ ζῶον οὐσίαν αὐτὸ εἶναι λέγοντες ἔμψυχον αἰσθητικόν). ἐπεὶ ὅσα μὴ ἔχει ὑπόστασιν οἰκείαν, ἀλλ' εἰσὶ φωναὶ δμώνυμοι ὡς ὁ κύων καὶ ὁ Αἴας καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, ταῦτα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπὶ πλέον· ψιλὰ γὰρ εἰσὶ φωνὰ καὶ οὐ πράγματα. That the alternative 'hypostasis on its own'—'hypostasis in something else' is not mutually exclusive in the philosophical context is also shown by the discussion on the ontological status of immattered forms (cf. bel. n. 324).

individuals participating in the same species necessarily possess properly and individually what constitutes its substance? How can they share their very own self with somebody or something else? This problem goes finally back to Plato's sail-cloth dilemma (*Parmenides* 130e–133a) and forms the background of Aristotle's ἴδιον-argument in *Metaphysics* VII,13 (1038b8–23): If the idea or essence of something is to be common to several participants, how can it be proper to any of them?²⁹³ If they are in a way covered by it, like several people by a sail-cloth, everyone will only 'possess' the small part covering him, not the cloth in its entirety.

3.3.5.1. *The Problem of Participation*

In examining how the commentators tried to solve this problem, we must distinguish sharply between the participation of species in their genera and that of individuals in their species. The former is of course made possible by the all-embracing ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις of the κοινωνία τῶν γένων (cf. *Sophist* 251–258) in the Nous, i.e. the actual coexistence or community of every genus and every species or difference with every other (e.g. of rationality and irrationality within the genus 'animal') without losing their proper identities.²⁹⁴ The commentators give three reasons for the possibility of such an actual coincidence of opposites:

- (1) Those opposites are not φθαρτικά, but ὑποστατικά ἀλλήλων, i.e. not a contradictory, but a privative opposition, where the privative element is dependent on the affirmative one. Those oppositions therefore lack any kind of hostility: they do not fight against each other in order to occupy a corporeal subject, like e.g. warm and cold do, but the affirmative one saves the privative one.²⁹⁵

²⁹³ Cf. also the criticism of the doctrine of ideas in *Metaphysics* I,9 991a12–14: ἀλλὰ μὴν οὔτε πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστήμην οὐδὲν βοηθεῖ [scil. τὰ εἶδη] τὴν τῶν ἄλλων (οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐσία ἐκεῖνα τούτων. ἐν τοῖς γὰρ ἂν ᾦν), οὔτε εἰς τὸ εἶναι, μὴ ἐνυπάρχοντά γε τοῖς μετέχουσιν.

²⁹⁴ Cf. Proclus, *In Parmenidem* I, 155–163 (on this passage: W. Beierwaltes, *Proklos. Grundzüge seiner Metaphysik*, Frankfurt ²1979, 31–48) / Simplicius, *In Phys.*; CAG IX, 99,32–102,15. 404,21–26. 405,24–406,16; *Commentarius in Epicteti enchiridion*, in: *Theophrasti characteres*, ed. F. Dübner, Paris 1842, 99,50–100,9 / Syrianus, *In Met.*; CAG VI/1, 24,11–16. The concept seems to have been developed in the context of a critical reception of the Stoic theory of mixture (cf. Asclepius, *In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 439,10–16). For the tradition and Christological reception of this motive cf. L. Abramowski, "συνάφεια und ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις als Bezeichnung für trinitarische und christologische Einheit", in: *Drei christologische Untersuchungen*, Berlin/New York 1981 (BZNW 45), 63–109, esp. 63–70.

²⁹⁵ Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 103,10–23 / Asclepius, *In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 439,21 f. / Elias, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/1, 85,11–21 / David, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/2, 190,22–29. Cf. also Simplicius,

- (2) A simultaneous inexistence of opposites is only excluded in a corporeal subject. An incorporeal one, like soul or nature, contains simultaneously the opposite logoi of good and bad, warm and cold actually, simultaneously and in the same respect without mingling them.²⁹⁶ Such an intermingling of different species, like that of donkey and horse in mule, could only happen between composite individuals, not between simple differences which constitute a species in completely conserving their essence without suffering any alteration from one another.²⁹⁷
- (3) The unifying force (δύναμις ἐνοποιός) of the three first hypostases is so strong that they remain simple despite having different aspects, like substance, life and goodness, and all the ideas participate in that of the second one, the intellect. Hence, an idea remains a simple unity in all its multiple irradiations and causations of different sensible entities.²⁹⁸

Much more problematic is, however, the case of temporally and spatially different individuals participating in one and the same species. The two most extensive expositions of the 'threefold universal' in Ammonius and David²⁹⁹ are very disappointing in that respect. Both texts seem to struggle

cius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 77,15–78,3. 107,19–24. The passage from Ammonius' *Isagoge*-commentary is translated in its entirety in Sorabji, *Sourcebook* III, 121f.

²⁹⁶ CAG IV/3,103,23–104,12 / CAG VI/2, 439,16–21 / CAG XVIII/1, 85,21–86,1 / CAG XVIII/2, 190,29–191,8 (David drops the crucial point of incorporeality and just mentions prime matter and sense-perceptions as two examples of the simultaneous reception of opposites; he is also the only one to dismiss both arguments in 191,9–192,8). On those logoi cf. bel. n. 302. On the 'integrating power' of incorporeals cf. also Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, ed. E. Diehl, Vol. III, Leipzig 1906 (repr. Amsterdam 1965), 122,20–24.

²⁹⁷ CAG IV/3,125,9–20.

²⁹⁸ CAG VI/2, 439,23–31.

²⁹⁹ Both *In Isagog*; CAG IV/3,39,14–45,15 / XVIII/2,113,11–118,4. Both offer a doxography (39,14–41,9 and 114,7–116,2), a comparison of which with that of Syrianus, *In Met.*; CAG VI/1, 105,19–107,3 at least display a different tendency between Athenian and Alexandrian Neoplatonism. Against I. Hadot, *Commentaire sur les Catégories*, fasc. I, Leiden 1990, 128–130, the harmony of Plato and Aristotle concerning the doctrine of ideas seems to have been held or at least been sympathized with by a majority of the Alexandrian school, but they were not entirely certain about it and did not defend it consistently. Philoponus' later attacks on this harmony (*De aeternitate mundi* II, ed. Rabe, 25–41; summarized *In Anal. Post.*; CAG XIII/3 241,17–243,25) is directed exactly against his former schoolmates (cf. e.g. "Philoponus I", *In De anim.*; CAG XV, 37,17–32 / Asclepius, *In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 166,30–168,18 / Simplicius, *In Phys.*; CAG IX, 295,12–296,9. 296,32–298,17). Olympiodorus' and Elias' claim of Plato's and Aristotle's harmony concerning the use of τὸδε and τοιόνδε referring to universal and particular substances is also an implicit claim of their harmony concerning the doctrine of ideas (cf. both *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 68,34–69,12 and XVIII/1, 177,24–178,1). On "Philoponus I and II" cf. bel. n. 306. On the issue of harmonization between Plato and Aristotle in the Athenian and Alexandrian school in general cf. my *Platon und Aristoteles in der Kosmologie des Proklos. Ein*

hard with the obvious disagreement between Plato and Aristotle on the subject matter and leave the problem of participation intentionally unsettled: Ammonius seems to aim at a coordination of the three types of universals as owing their difference to that of the different scientific approaches to which they correspond. Probably inspired by Aristotle's exposition of his theory of science in *De anima* I,1 403a29–b18,³⁰⁰ he assumes the metaphysician or theologian, the natural philosopher and the logician to be in need of a different conception of a universal.³⁰¹ Thus, he says, the theological (i.e. metaphysical) consideration has to figure out whether the ante-res universals or ideas are self-subsisting intelligible substances (according to Plato) or not (according to Aristotle), and—more importantly for our purposes—the physical consideration has to determine whether 'animal itself' (τὸ ἄπλῶς ζῶον) is one nature common to all its instances or rather an individual form,³⁰² whereas the logical consideration would of course deal with abstract post res-concepts. David reports an objection against the threefold universal which rejects the existence of ante-res universals based on Aristotle's authority (*Anal. Post.* I,22 83a31f. and *De anima* I,1 402b7f. are quoted) and argues against that of in-re ones the following way: Either this in-re universal is one self-subsisting nature in which many instances participate, or there are many (similar) natures in the many different instances. In the latter case, it would be no longer one universal, but many particulars. The former case would imply ante-res universals and is thus ruled out by the authority of Aristotle.³⁰³ David's reply correlating God's and our knowledge and locating the subsistence of in-re universals in both of them completely misses the problem in question, as of course neither of these modes of universal existence is really a community in the things themselves.³⁰⁴

Kommentar zu den 18 Argumenten für die Ewigkeit der Welt bei Johannes Philoponos, Tübingen 2009 (STAC 54), 23–33.

³⁰⁰ Cf. esp. the remark on the difference between the physical and the dialectical/logical concept of wrath in *De anima* I,1 403a29–b2.

³⁰¹ Maybe he developed this approach in his lost treatise on the final cause as efficient cause in Aristotle, which was used by the Arabic author of treatise on the harmony between Plato and Aristotle usually attributed to Al-Farabi. Cf. B. Gleede, "Creatio ex nihilo—a genuinely philosophical insight derived from Plato and Aristotle? Some notes on the treatise on the harmony between the two sages", in: *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 22 (2012), 91–117.

³⁰² CAG IV/3, 43,25–44,4; 44,8–12. 44,4–12 could be interpreted as assigning a kind of 'in rebus-universality' to the logoi of nature or 'natures', which according to Proclus despite their dispersal over different bodies retain a certain unity in that they constitute a sympathy between them (*In Parmenidem*, ed. C. Steel/C. Macé/P. d'Hoine, vol. 3, Oxford 2009, 128 [1136,11–17 C.]).

³⁰³ CAG XVIII/2, 117,5–9.

³⁰⁴ Ibid. 117,33–118,3.

However, a solution might be found in the discussion of the term κοινόν in the commentaries on the very first line of the *Categories*. Something can be “common” either (1) without being divided, like a slave shared by different owners, or (2) with being divided, like a breakfast being partly consumed by different people, or (3) by successive alternation of the actual possession, like a seat in the theatre, or (4) in being temporally and locally participated in to the same degree and without differentiation, like the human nature by its individuals. The crucial point is of course case (4). Ammonius explains this ἀδιαιρέτως μεθεκτόν by the fact that every human being participates ‘undividedly’ in every trait of the genus ‘animal’.³⁰⁵ Philoponus³⁰⁶ and Olympiodorus use wordings which might recall Plotinus’ solution of the sail cloth dilemma:³⁰⁷ according to those two, every member of a species participates in it to the same degree, it is, as Olympiodorus puts it “granting itself to every single one of its participants in entirety” (ὅλον ἑαυτὸ παρέχον ἐκάστω τῶν μετεχόντων αὐτοῦ).³⁰⁸ They are both using an example which strongly resembles the daylight one rejected in *Parmenides* 131b: the voice of the messenger

³⁰⁵ *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 19,10–12: Τὸ κοινὸν λέγεται τετραχῶς· ἢ τὸ ἀδιαιρέτως μεθεκτόν, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ζώου (αὐτοῦ γὰρ πάντες μετέχουσιν ἀδιαιρέτως· οὐ γὰρ τὰ μὲν οὐσίας μόνῃς ἀπολαύει, τὰ δὲ ἐμψύχου μόνου, τὰ δὲ αἰσθήσεως μόνῃς). That this discussion of the term “common” was originally related to that of the ontological status of universals is shown by Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii* I,10; ed. S. Brandt, Leipzig 1906 (CSEL 48), 162,16–163,3: una enim res si communis est, aut partibus communis est et non iam tota communis, sed partes eius propriae singulorum, aut in usus habentium etiam per tempora transit, ut sit commune ut seruus communis uel equus, aut uno tempore omnibus commune fit, non tamen ut eorum quibus commune est, substantiam constituat, ut est theatrum uel spectaculum aliquod, quod spectantibus omnibus commune est. genus uero secundum nullum horum modum commune esse speciebus potest; nam ita commune esse debet, ut et totum sit in singulis et uno tempore et eorum quorum commune est, constituere ualeat et formare substantiam. quocirca si neque unum est, quoniam commune est, neque multa, quoniam eius quoque multitudinis genus aliud inquirendum est, uidebitur genus omnino non esse, idem que de ceteris intellegendum est.

³⁰⁶ It seems obvious that the statements of Philoponus’ earlier commentaries developed from Ammonius’ lectures are in many cases inconsistent with his later philosophical convictions. Although K. Verrycken’s distinction between Philoponus I who is still more or less faithful to the doctrine of his teacher Ammonius and an antiaristotelian Philoponus II (cf. “The development of Philoponus thought and its chronology”, in: *Aristotle Transformed. The Ancient Commentators and their Influence*, ed. R. Sorabji, Ithaca 1990, 233–274) may thus seem justified to a certain extent, it is clearly in several respects overstated (cf. the appropriate criticism of C. Scholten, *Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift ‘De opificio mundi’ des Johannes Philoponos*, Berlin/New York 1996, 118–143).

³⁰⁷ Cf. ab. before n. 293.

³⁰⁸ Both *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 18,30–19,4 and XII/1, 30,33–31,1. Cf. Plotinus VI 4 [22], 2,46–49: εἰ δὲ μήτε τὸ πόρρω μήτε τὸ ἐγγύθεν, ἀνάγκη ὅλον παρεῖναι, εἴπερ πάρεστι. Καὶ ὅλως ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνων ἐκάστω, οἷς μήτε πόρρωθεν ἐστὶ μήτε ἐγγύθεν, δυνατοῖς δὲ δεῖξασθαι ἐστίν.

which is received as a whole by everyone in town while being numerically one. The metaphysical background of this 'undivided community' is, however, most clearly revealed by Elias, who adds the examples of the centre common to all the radii of a circle and the generic matter common to all its specific forms.³⁰⁹ Especially the former was of central relevance in Plotinus' treatment of the problem in VI 4–5 (22–23).³¹⁰ According to this text, every incorporeal entity is ubiquitarian (i.e. can be participated in whenever and wherever) because of its strict transcendence with respect to all its participants: Only because an idea is not allocated to a single one of them, it can be participated in by every one according to its capacity, just as an incorporeal force acting on the whole of an inhomogeneously structured body differs in its effects according to the different capacities of the recipient's constitutive parts (VI 4 [22], 7,9–23). Accordingly, no genus or species would actually inhere in a material individual, but only show (some of) its effects according to the latter's capability as a matter.

Yet, for later Neoplatonists, Plotinus' solution failed to meet Aristotle's aforementioned³¹¹ ὅλον-argument against the substantial character of universals: As the substance or essence of a thing must be, if anything, proper to this very thing, it cannot be universal, i.e. common to several things (*Metaphysics* VII,13 1038b8–23). Proclus' distinction between the unparticipated and the participated idea³¹² is designed to overcome this weakness of the Neoplatonic position. But, as a consequence, it is neither able to maintain the common or universal character of the imparticipated idea, which is absolutely transcendent and possessed by none of its participants, nor that of the participated one, which only belongs to its very own participant. A passage in Simplicius' commentary on the *Categories* clearly expounds the threefold-universal-doctrine exactly along those lines and finally states that the only proper universal is the abstract concept in our

³⁰⁹ *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 154,13–155,8. For the Aristotelian analogy of genus:species = matter:form cf. H. Steinfath, "Die Einheit der Definition (Z 12 und H 6)", in: *Aristoteles, Metaphysik. Die Substanzbücher (Z, H, Θ)*, ed. C. Rapp, Berlin 1996 (KA 4), 229–251. The voice-example is also used in Denys, *De divinis nominibus* V,9 (ed. B.R. Suchla, Berlin 1990 [PTS 33], 189,5f.).

³¹⁰ Cf. esp. VI 5 (23), 5; 11,14–31 and the commentary of C. Tornau, *Plotin: Enneaden VI 4–5* (22–23). *Ein Kommentar*, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1998 (BzA 113), esp. the summary on 499–505.

³¹¹ Cf. ab. n. 293.

³¹² Cf. *Elements of Theology*, prop. 23f., 81 and for the relation to Plotinus esp. 98 (ed. Dodds, 26f.76.86f.) and L. Sweeney, "Participation and the Structure of Being in Proclus' *Elements of Theology*", in: *The Structure of Being. A Neoplatonic Approach*, ed. R. Baine Harris, Albany 1982, 140–155. 177–181.

minds.³¹³ Accordingly, he also makes clear on *Cat.* 1a1 that the so-called ἀδιαίρετος κοινότης of both a voice and a slave has nothing to do with participation, but is rather a matter of χρήσις which can either be exerted simultaneously by several people (in case of the voice) or not (in case of the slave).³¹⁴ Thus, the in rebus-universal sacrifices its universality in order to become proper to every single individual according to Aristotelian demands.

3.3.5.2. *The Problem of Individuation and Immattered Forms*

The problem how those participated instances are actually appropriated or inexist the individual has already been touched upon in our discussion of the rapport between ‘accident in subject’ and ‘form in matter’.³¹⁵ Examining the commentaries, however, with respect to their general account of the ἐν-υλον εἶδος, i.e. the species as participated in by a (material) individual, one detects further deviations from the fairly clear Aristotelian solution Alexander had offered for the problem.³¹⁶ On the one hand, there is a clear tendency to approximate the ἐνυλον εἶδος to the accident in Neoplatonism, which will also have yielded Elias’ aforementioned treatment of the forms as accidents of matter.³¹⁷ Already Porphyry had introduced the ‘immattered form’ by distinguishing between two kinds of incorporeals, proper ones, which are separable from matter, and ‘privative’ incorporeals which are dependent on something else for their existence, such as matter, immattered forms, natures and powers. The latter’s mode of existence is barely distinguishable from that of accidents, as they are explicitly claimed to be inseparable from their subjects and dependent on them.³¹⁸ For Proclus, the immattered forms are the weakest, most dependent kind of inexistent reality, as they “exist exclusively in other entities, exclusively belong to other entities and are grounded in certain substrates” (ἐν ἄλλοις ὄντα μόνον καὶ ἄλλων ὄντα καὶ ἐν

³¹³ CAG VIII, 69,3–71,2.

³¹⁴ *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 26,11–20.

³¹⁵ Cf. ab. nn. 218–223.

³¹⁶ Cf. ab. n. 212.

³¹⁷ Cf. ab. n. 241. Other commentators also state that immattered form and matter are the two simple substances of minor ontological value than the composite substance, because the only purpose of their existence is the constitution of the composite substance (Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 35,18–24 / Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 49,23–27. 67,7–10 / Olympiodorus, *In Cat.*; CAG XII/1, 58,1f. / Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 162,10–15).

³¹⁸ *Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes* 19, ed. E. Lambert, Leipzig 1975, 10,5–9: καὶ τὰ μὲν πρὸ σωμάτων, τὰ δὲ μετὰ σωμάτων· καὶ τὰ μὲν χωριστὰ σωμάτων, τὰ δὲ ἀχώριστα· καὶ τὰ μὲν καθ’ ἑαυτὰ ὑφεστηκότα, τὰ δὲ ἄλλων εἰς τὸ εἶναι δεόμενα· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐνεργεῖαις τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ζωαῖς αὐτοκινήτοις, τὰ δὲ ταῖς ζωαῖς παρυφισταμέναις ταῖς ποιαῖς ἐνεργεῖαις.

τισιν ὑποκειμένοις ἐδραζόμενα).³¹⁹ Hence, the ἔνυλα εἶδη participate to a considerable extent in the fate of the composite entities they belong to, i.e. they are coming to be and passing away together with them.³²⁰

On the other hand, there is also a tendency to maintain their character as essential parts of the subject³²¹ or allocated, inexistent species, yet on grounds different from the classical Peripatetic ones.³²² According to Jamblichus, the immattered form has “some kind of substance of its own together with the [composite] entities, according to which it characterizes its participants and arranges them in accordance with its own proportion”,³²³ and for Simplicius it does not entirely belong to matter, but has “both an own hypostasis by itself and a common one together with matter” (καὶ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν καὶ μετὰ τῆς ὅλης κοινὴν).³²⁴ In fact, the commentaries on *Physics* II,2 also reject the Aristotelian concept of forms which are not definable without respect to a certain kind of matter, illustrated by the so-called ‘coupled terms’ (snub-nosed). The form, the immattered likeness of the intelligible paradigm, must always have at least a certain reality

³¹⁹ *In Parmenidem* III, 128 (1136,9–11 C.). The context of this passage (on Parm 138a; *ibid.*, 127–129 [1135,5–1137,21 C.]) describes a complex hierarchy of in-being: He names six classes of entities, immattered forms, natures, (body-)related souls, non-related divine souls, the intellect and the One, and distinguishes between two kinds or ‘directions’ of in-being. From the related souls downwards, the entities are no longer able to “step out of their causes completely” and become dependent on something lower in order to exist. From the divine souls upwards, the entities are only in their causes, “nowhere” with respect to anything lower than them, but encompassed (περιεχόμενον) by their cause.

³²⁰ Syrianus, *In Met.*; CAG VI/1, 105,30–35 / Simplicius, *In Phys.*; CAG IX, 257,17f.27–33 / Philoponus, *In De anima*; CAG XV, 121,26–30. 543,13–15 / Asclepius, *In Met.*; CAG VI/1, 413,6–27. 440,24–27 (Aristotle’s argument for the incorruptibility of the form is referred to the form per se, not in composition with matter). Unlike those commentators, Proclus seems to have regarded the immattered form as per se perishable, not as per accidens participating in the destruction of its participants (cf. the fragment reported by Philoponus, *De aeternitate mundi* IX,11; ed. Rabe, 364,7–365,3).

³²¹ Ammonius, *In Cat.*; CAG IV/4, 28,3–6 / Philoponus, *In Cat.*; CAG XIII/1, 34,12–15 / Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 151,30f. One cannot be sure whether there can be made much of the fact that neither Simplicius (CAG VIII, 50,14f.) nor Olympiodorus (CAG XII/1, 48,23f.) argue for any difference between the inexistence of an accident and an immattered form, but just point to the fact that the *Categories* only deal with the composite substance.

³²² Cf. the passages from Alexander referred to above n. 212. For the term “allocated” (συν- or κατατεγμένος) cf. Lloyd, *Anatomy*, 65–68; Thiel, *Kategorienschrift*, 254–257, Leontius of Byzantium, CNE 1281D and the monophysite opponent in Anastasius’ antitritheite dialogue: “Des Patriarchen Anastasius I. von Antiochien Jerusalem Streitgespräch mit einem Tritheiten”, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, in: *Traditio* 37 (1981), (73–108), 102 (ll. 747f.).

³²³ Apud Simplicium, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 130,14–19 (τινα ἰδίαν μετὰ τῶν πραγμάτων οὐσίαν, καθ’ ἣν ἀφορίζει καὶ πρὸς τὸ οἰκείον μέτρον συντάττει τὰ μετέχοντα).

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, 99,28f. Cf. ab. n. 251.

of its own, even if it is only conceptually separable from matter.³²⁵ In a typically Platonic manner, the essential character of the immattered form is thus not secured by intensifying its connection to the individual, but by loosening it so such a degree that it is able to retain its own hypostasis next to its shared one—a conception which could have been welcome to Nestorian theologians, yet quite troublesome for Chalcedonians.

Yet, if the ‘immattered form’ necessarily retains a hypostasis of its own distinct from matter in order to remain substantial, it is hard to see how its numerical pluralization³²⁶ can be exclusively due to its materialization, as the commentators frequently underscore, repeating the Aristotelian topos of matter as the principle of individuation (*Physics* I,7 190b24–26; *Metaphysics* VII,8 1034a5–9; VII,11 1037a1 f.; XII,8 1074a33 f.): Asclepius, among others, explains that the individual, i.e. the immattered form, is “cut”, “divided” or “circumscribed” by matter.³²⁷ Being fully determined, a species infima can no longer yield multiple members by addition of a further difference, but just realizes itself in different “portions” of matter. Trying to approach the problem of individuation from a logical point of view, Porphyry had therefore suggested the subdivision of an infima species by diverse accidents or properties, the unique configuration or bundle (ἄθροισμα or συνδρομή) of which then constitutes the individual,³²⁸ not in the sense of technically

³²⁵ Philoponus, *In Phys.*; CAG XVI, 225,5–226,11 / Simplicius, *In Phys.*; CAG IX, 295,28–296,31 (cf. the concise exposition of what they regard to be Aristotle’s opinion in 293,30–294,12). Whether or not matter has to be included in any kind of definition seems to be a question answered very inconsistently by Aristotle himself (cf. Kremer, *Metaphysikbegriff*, p. 18 n. 3). A solution for this inconsistency could be that “eine Definition der Form [of a physical object; B.G.] auch ohne explizite Berücksichtigung des Stoffes verständlich macht, mit welchem Stoff diese Form notwendig verbunden ist” (W. Mesch, “Die Teile der Definition (Z 10–11)”, in: Rapp, *Die Substanzbücher*, [135–156] 151).

³²⁶ On the discussion of individuation in general cf. also the texts collected by Sorabji, *Sourcebook* III, 164–175.

³²⁷ *In Met.*; CAG VI/2, 144,30 f.; 148,25–27; 216,31–33. A more detailed metaphysical description of the intended process is given in Philoponus’ commentary on the *Physics* (CAG XVI, 475,7–476,19 cf. 492,26–493,15): The pluralization of form is due to the interaction of the limit and the unlimited, as the form being wholly present in every one of its instances can only be multiplied and divided by its opposite, matter, the principle of infinity and indeterminability. Entering matter, a form is split apart into infinite separate parts (or instances) infinitely divisible themselves. The concrete materia proxima individuating a concrete infima species is, however, the result of diverse factors governing the process of becoming and thus causing the different properties of the ‘bundle’, i.e. “the movements of heaven, the particular natures, the peculiarities of seasons, the [different] regions and their guardian-gods” (Proclus, *In Parmenidem* I, 238 [825,9–30 C.]; cf. I, 224 [813,11–21 C.] and Simplicius, *In Cael.*; CAG VII, 277,8–15).

³²⁸ CAG IV/1, 7,19–27 (ἐξ ιδιοτήτων συνέστηκεν ἕκαστον, ὧν τὸ ἄθροισμα οὐκ ἂν ἐπ’ ἄλλου ποτὲ τὸ αὐτὸ γένοιτο) cf. *In Cat.*; CAG IV/1, 129,9 f. (ιδιότης συνδρομῆς ποιότητων). On tradition and

defining it, but in the sense of describing it³²⁹ and marking it off from any other individual. Whether Porphyry thus really wanted to introduce a principle of individuation different from matter, has to remain unclear, as both ‘principles’ are easily to reconcile, as long as one keeps in mind that in the case of concrete individuals of a species the proximate matter responsible for individuation is nothing but the principle of concrete, non-essential attributes and circumstances distinguishing this instantiation of the species from every other.³³⁰ Nevertheless, several texts take Porphyry’s ‘principle’ at face value and problematize it in that the only really incommunicable accident of an individual, its unique position in space and time, is also the least enduring one and hence most inadequate for an individual characterisation.³³¹ David presents us with an interesting little dialogue between a Peripatetic and a Platonic philosopher, in which the latter wants to defend Porphyry’s formula against the former’s objection that this formula would render accidents essential parts of substances.³³² As the Platonist accepts the Peripatetic’s dismissal of his first and only valid reply, that the formula is only of epistemological value, he is forced to give the somewhat unsatisfactory answer that ‘individuating’ accidents become substantial to their individuals, just like differences (substantial qualities) do to their species.³³³ Olympiodorus reports that Proclus dismissed the Porphyrian formula in his

parallels, esp. the relationship to Plato (*Theaetetus* 157b/c. 209c; *Timaeus* 49f.) and the Stoic ἰδίως ποιόν, cf. Lloyd, *Anatomy*, 43–47; Id., *Form and universal in Aristotle*, Liverpool 1981, 67f.; R. Sorabji, *Matter, Space and Motion. Theories in Antiquity and their sequel*, Ithaca 1988, 44–59 (including a discussion of Gregory of Nyssa on 52–56).

³²⁹ Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 56,15f. 57,14f.; cf. Philoponus, *In Phys.*; CAG XVI, 76,17–23.

³³⁰ This is probably why Ammonius accepts both of them without any problems (*In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 90,1–24 cf. 60,16–21). Cf. Lloyd, *Anatomy*, 46f.

³³¹ Elias, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/1, 76,8–11 cf. David, *In Isagog.*, CAG XVIII/2, 168,1–15.

³³² CAG XVIII/2, 168,16–169,17. Cf. the discussion of the same problem in Leontius of Jerusalem bel. at nn. 477–484. The problems in applying the principle to the trinity emerge e.g. in Eulogius of Alexandria’s anti-tritheite discussions against the equation of idiom and hypostasis and against the definition of hypostasis as συμπλοκή οὐσίας καὶ ἰδιώματος (apud Photium, cod. 230 279a8–280b35; ed. R. Henry, vol. 5, Paris 1967, 42–51).

³³³ CAG XVIII/2, 169,6–17: φασιν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄτοπον συμπληροῦν τὰ συμβεβηκότα τὴν οὐσίαν, πρὸς ἄλλο δὲ εἶναι συμβεβηκότα καὶ πρὸς ἄλλο οὐσίαν· ὥς γὰρ τὸ θερμὸν τὸ ἐν τῷ πυρὶ λέγεται καὶ οὐσία καὶ συμβεβηκός (πρὸς μὲν γὰρ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ πυρὸς λέγεται συμβεβηκός, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πῦρ οὐσία· οὐσία γὰρ τοῦ πυρὸς ἢ θερμότης), καὶ ὥς φαμεν τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι ψυχρὸν καὶ συμβεβηκός εἶναι καὶ οὐσίαν, συμβεβηκός μὲν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ὕδατος, οὐσίαν δὲ πρὸς τὸ ὕδωρ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ φαλακρὸν τοῦ Σωκράτους συμβεβηκός φαμεν καὶ οὐσίαν, συμβεβηκός μὲν πρὸς τὸν Σωκράτην, καθὼ ἀνθρωπός ἐστιν, οὐσίαν δὲ αὐτοῦ, καθὼ συμπληροῖ τὸν Σωκράτην· οὐσία γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ φαλακρότης, συμβεβηκός δὲ, καθὼ καὶ ἄλλοις γίνεται. καὶ οὐ θαυμαστόν, εἰ ταῦτα οὐσία λέγεται· πᾶν γὰρ συμβεβηκός θέλει μετέχειν οὐσίας, ἵνα μὴ πάντῃ ἀμοιρήσῃ τῆς κρείττονος οὐσίας.

commentary on *Alcibiades* 129b1 for exactly that reason.³³⁴ Simplicius, for his part, explicitly dismisses matter as principle of individuation in favour of the Porphyrian formula,³³⁵ yet in the context of a proof for the eternity of prime matter, which is obviously unable to serve as principle of individuation for a concrete infima species.

Due to the Cappadocians' reception of the Porphyrian 'principle' as their definition of hypostasis, the Church fathers will soon—at least in the seventh century—surpass their philosophical colleagues in discussing its implications, whereas the exact meaning of 'inexistence' unfortunately remains similarly ambiguous in both camps. Despite all the attempts at precision concerning in-being as as accident, completing substantial part or form, which were—as we have seen in Leontius of Byzantium—at least partially noticed also by the fathers,³³⁶ there are also passages where the commentators explicitly admit the impossibility of distinguishing substantial from accidental properties with perfect accuracy.³³⁷

3.4. EPHREM OF AMID

Ephrem of Amid, patriarch of Antioch from 526 until 544, died about one year after Leontius of Byzantium, and thus cannot have written considerably later.³³⁸ He wrote an apology for Chalcedon and the *Tome of Leo* which must have drawn quite heavily upon that of John the Grammarian.³³⁹ It is quite astonishing that our term was in his time already important enough

³³⁴ Olympiodorus, *Commentary on the first Alcibiades of Plato*, ed. L.G. Westerink, Amsterdam 1956 (repr. 1982), sect. 204,8–12: καὶ οὐ μόνον διὰ τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι ἤμαρτεν ὁ Περίπατος περὶ τὸ ἄτομον, οἰηθεὶς αὐτὸ ἐκ τῆς συνδρομῆς τῶν συμβεβηκότων γίνεσθαι. διὸ καὶ οὕτως ὀρίζεται αὐτό· 'οὐδ' τὸ ἄθροισμα οὐκ ἂν ἐπ' ἄλλου ποτέ γένοιτο· καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν χειρόνων, τῶν συμβεβηκότων, τὰ κρείττονα ἐποιοῦν. Proclus' commentary is only extant until *Alcibiades* 116a/b.

³³⁵ *In Phys.*; CAG IX, 255,27–256,1. A similar rejection could be implied by Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 176,11–15 and David, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/2, 195,24–27.

³³⁶ Cf. bel. n. 358 (Pamphilus), n. 422 (Leontius of Jerusalem) and John of Damascus, *Dial. fus.* 39 (= *Dial. brev.* 22), in: *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. B. Kotter, vol. 1, Berlin 1969 (PTS 7), 106.

³³⁷ E.g. Simplicius, *In Cat.*; CAG VIII, 96,16–19.

³³⁸ For his life cf. Helmer, *Neuchalkedonismus*, 185–187; P.T.R. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Leiden 1979 (SHCT 20), 141f.; T. Hainthaler in A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Vol. II/3: *Die Kirche von Jerusalem und Antiochen nach 451 bis 600*, ed. T. Hainthaler, Freiburg a.e. 2002, 357–359.

³³⁹ John of Damascus quotes it as περὶ τοῦ γραμματικοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῆς συνόδου (*Sacra parallela*; MSG 96, 481C). For further evidence of Ephrem's dependence on the Grammarian cf. Helmer, *Neuchalkedonismus*, 162f. n. 334; 189f. According to *ibid.*, 189, we have treated CPG 6902 and 6904 as identical above.

to be embodied in the 26 *chapters of dogmatic definitions according to etymology* Ephrem wrote against Acacius the philosopher and presbyter of Apameia (CPG 6906). In the small fragment which has been preserved we find the definitions and/or etymologies of ὁρος, οὐσία, μορφή, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον, ἰδίωμα, ἐνέργεια, ὁμοούσιος and finally—with 7¼ lines in Helmer's edition the most extensive one—ἐνυπόστατος:

Ἐνυπόστατον is what is established in a hypostasis, like size, whiteness or fatherhood, or again what is a proper being and is known without fantasy in existence. Of course, we do not call God the Logos' flesh a hypostasis, for it did not subsist by itself as any simple hypostasis does. Nor do we call it ἀνυπόστατον, which signifies the non-existent, wherefore we define it as ἐνυπόστατον or ἐνύπαρκτον or also ἐνούσιον nature.³⁴⁰

As Gray has already noticed, the passage only makes sense, if we refer the first meaning of ἐνυπόστατος to the human nature of Christ and the second one to the simple hypostasis.³⁴¹ To conceive of this flesh as φύσις ἐνυπόστατος is for Ephrem apparently the way to avoid the extremes of having to call it hypostasis or ἀνυπόστατον. Yet, after what we have read in Leontius and after all our examinations of the traditional usage of our term, at first sight it seems almost inexplicable how Ephrem is able to adduce as the first and apparently basic meaning of our term “what is established in a hypostasis, i.e. accidents”.³⁴² Moreover, he attaches the same meaning also to two synonyms of ἐνυπόστατος in its traditional usage,³⁴³ i.e. ἐνύπαρκτος and ἐνούσιος.

³⁴⁰ Helmer, *Neuchalkedonismus*, 272,6–11: Ἐνυπόστατόν ἐστιν τὸ ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει καθιδρυμένον οἷον μακρότης ἢ λευκότης ἢ πατρότης ἢ πάλιν τὸ κυρίως ὄν καὶ ἀφαντάτως ἐν ὑπάρξει γνωριζόμενον. Τὴν μέντοι τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σάρκα οὐχ ὑπόστασιν λέγομεν, οὐ γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑπέστη ὡς πᾶσα ψιλὴ ὑπόστασις. Οὐτε πάλιν αὐτὴν φάμεν ἀνυπόστατον ὅπερ σημαίνει τὸ ἀνύπαρκτον, διόπερ αὐτὴν φύσιν ὀρίζομεν ἐνυπόστατον ἡγουν ἐνύπαρκτόν τε καὶ ἐνούσιον. In taking the last three adjectives as neutra, the translation of Gray, *Defense*, 149 seems to miss the fact that composite adjectives do not have a female ending. Cf. also T. Hainthaler's translation in Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/3, 369. However, Hainthaler's assumption of a dependence on Leontius' of Byzantium *Epilysis* (ibid. and n. 70)—only based on the examples for accidents which are not even the same—is unfounded.

³⁴¹ Ibid., 149 f.

³⁴² The verb καθιδρῦεσθαι normally signifies the ontological dependence on some kind of ἔδρα—a quite common metaphor in the context of the inheritance-problem. Cf. e.g. Plotinus, *Ennead* VI 3,4 l. 3 f. / Proclus, *In Parmenidem* I, 132 (730,7 f. C.) or II, 31 (861,16–18 C.).

³⁴³ Cf. esp., Ps-Basil, *Contra Eunomium* V (MSG 29, 713C): Ἄλλ' ὥπερ οὐ προφορικὸς λόγος ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ζῶν καὶ ὑφεστηκώς, καὶ τῶν ὄλων δραστήριος· οὕτως ἐν τῷ Θεῷ οὐ πνεῦμα διαχεόμενον, οὐ διαλυόμενος ἀήρ, ἀλλὰ δύναμις ἁγιαστικὴ, ἐνούσιος, ἐνύπαρκτος, ἐνυπόστατος. For ἐνούσιος and ἐνυπόστατος cf. Didymus, *In Zach.* II, 139,2 (SC 84, 486); Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* VII, 32,61 (GCS NF 1, 381 f.) or Cyril (ab. n. 112). For the much rarer ἐνύπαρκτος and ἐνυπόστατος cf.

In order to solve this problem one has to take into account the special kind of text we are dealing with here: Ephrem is far from describing the customary Greek usage of our term, but aims at clarifying its technical usage in the context of Chalcedonian Christology on the basis of its etymology. The rather crude etymologies he presents (μορφή from μέρος φέρειν etc.) just try to connect the different elements of a term to other Greek words which can somehow be related to the meaning Ephrem wants to attach to the term in question. In the case of ἐνυπόστατος, these elements obviously are the preposition ἐν and the noun ὑπόστασις, and those fit perfectly well with the meaning he wants the term to have when referred to Christ's human nature: 'not subsisting on its own, but *in* the hypostasis of the Logos'. Hence, the suspicion might arise that Ephrem only chose the starting-point from etymology exactly for the sake of refuting the 'no nature without hypostasis'-objection in stipulating a technical sense of ἐνυπόστατος for Christology on the basis of its obvious etymology. However that may be, the examples he gives (μακρότης, λευκότης, πατρότης) still seem—considering Leontius' clear distinction between ἐνυπόστατον and accident—very carelessly chosen: Even if one refers πατρότης exclusively to the trinitarian context, where it is of course no simple accident, but the property constituting the hypostasis of the father, 'big size' and 'whiteness' are still—in contrast to Leontius' shape and colour—concrete accidents, not necessary properties of the body per se. Nonetheless, the context in my opinion demands interpreting them not as simple accidents, but as constituting properties of a human hypostasis like Peter distinguished from Paul by the height of his body and the colour of his skin. This interpretation can be confirmed by some parallels interpreting the term ἐνούσιον as describing the necessary components to be found in a substance (i.e. specific difference and properties) or even the set of properties constituting a hypostasis. The former is affirmed by Anastasius Sinaïtes who postulates an analogous twofold meaning for both ἐνούσιον and ἐνυπόστατον: Just as ἐνούσιον can both signify the being itself and the essential traits in the being ('rational' and 'perishable' in the case of man), ἐνυπόστατον can both mean the truly existing thing and the distinguishing characteristics in the truly existing thing, which meaning is exemplified by the properties of the trinitarian persons.³⁴⁴ The lat-

Maximus, *Myst.* 20 (ed. C. Boudignon, Turnhout 2011 [CCG 69], 47) and *Op.* 16 (205B) or also Socrates (ab. n. 90). In Anastasius Sinaïtes, *Hodegos* II, 3,123 f. (CCG 8, 38) the three opposite terms appear together.

³⁴⁴ Cf. esp. Anastasius Sinaïtes, *Hodegos* II, 3,126–133; CCG 8, 39: Πάλιν ἐνούσιον λέγομεν ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ δὴν ἢ τὸ ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ γνωριζόμενον ἰδίωμα, οἷον ἐνούσιόν ἐστι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ λογιστικὸν καὶ

ter is asserted by John of Damascus, when he calls ἐνούσιον “that which is perceived in the substance, i.e. the bundle of accidents, which shows the hypostasis”.³⁴⁵

Thus, his etymological inspiration guides Ephrem to a result analogous to that of Leontius of Byzantium, but much less differentiated: The human nature of Christ, the focus on which clearly distinguishes the Neochalcedonian Ephrem from his Chalcedonian contemporary, maintains its status as ἐνυπόστατος, as it subsists in the hypostasis of the Logos, just as characteristic properties subsist in their hypostases and differentiate them from every other hypostasis.

That he nevertheless does not explicitly refer to the insubsistence formula is a bit disappointing, just as the fact that no other trace of it can be found in the admittedly scarce remnants of his works, neither in the reports of Photius (codd. 228f.) nor in the other remaining fragments. The objection ‘no nature without hypostasis’ is not refuted by pointing to the insubsistence of Christ’s human nature in the Logos, but by denying the axiom: Neither the ‘natures’ of water, wrath, war nor those of body and soul include (συνεισάγειν) a πρόσωπον of their own.³⁴⁶ As Pamphilus’ argument for the existence of φύσεις, but not οὐσίαι ἀνυπόστατοι shows,³⁴⁷ this is a resumption of the derived, more specific use of ἀνυπόστατος we encountered in Ps-Basil’s *Contra Eunomium* V, yet also echoes Leontius’ remark on the wider sense of ‘nature’ as compared to ‘substance’.³⁴⁸ However, as Ephrem in his defence of Cyril and his (orthodox Chalcedonian) understanding of the μία φύσις-formula also drew upon the pseudo-Athanasian *Epistula ad Jovianum* as an important authority,³⁴⁹ he might well have postulated also the insubsistence formula in the same context.

τὸ φθαρτόν. Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον κατὰ δύο τρόπους λέγεται, ἢ τὸ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὑπάρχον ἢ τὸ ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ἰδίωμα, ὡς ἐν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ τὸ ἀγέννητον, ἐν δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τὸ γεννητόν, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τὸ ἐκπορευτόν, καθὼς καὶ ἀνωτέρω εἴρηται. Cf. bel. before n. 588.

³⁴⁵ Cf. John of Damascus, *Ctr. Jacobitas* 11,5–8 (PTS 22, 114): Ἐτερον γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν τινι καὶ ἕτερον τὸ ἐν ᾧ· ἐνούσιον μὲν γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ θεωρούμενον, τουτέστι τὸ τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἄθροισμα, δὲ δηλοῖ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν οὐσίαν. Ἐνυπόστατον δὲ οὐχ ἡ ὑπόστασις, τὸ ἐν ὑποστάσει δὲ καθορώμενον. Cf. bel. after n. 634.

³⁴⁶ Photius, *Bibliotheca* cod. 229 256b24–33, ed. R. Henry, vol. 4, Paris 1965, 130.

³⁴⁷ *Panhoplion* II,132–156; CCG 19, 140f. Pamphilus’ examples are love, hate, time, lie and words.

³⁴⁸ MSG 86/I, 1280A quoted ab. at n. 182.

³⁴⁹ Cf. Photius, *Bibliotheca* 259b24–27; ed. Henry, 156. Cf. ab. n. 164.

3.5. PAMPHILUS THE THEOLOGIAN

Entering the second half of the sixth century, it becomes rather difficult to establish a relative chronology of our texts. For the *De sectis*, we have a fixed terminus ante quem: the end of Eulogius of Alexandria's patriarchate in 607/8.³⁵⁰ For Pamphilus and Leontius of Jerusalem, their silence about the monergetist/monotheletic problem is our only datum to establish one. As this problem was admittedly discussed before the official outbreak of the controversy³⁵¹ (Sophronius' of Jerusalem protest against the Alexandrian union with the Monophysites in 634), but will not have dominated the Christological discussion before the middle of the century, it is probably not possible to fix the terminus ante quem more precisely than 'about 650'. As our termini post quem are around 580 for both Leontius of Jerusalem³⁵² and

³⁵⁰ Cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 516 f. referring to MSG 86/I, 1232C. Ibid. 523 n. 91a he rejects the earlier dating (between 543–551) of M. van Esbroeck, "La date et l'auteur du *De sectis* attribué à Leonce de Byzance", in: *After Chalcedon. Studies in theology and Church history*, ed. C. Laga e.a., Leuven 1985, (415–424) 417–422 a little too quickly, as it was endorsed also by F. Carcione, "Il *De sectis* di Leonzio Scolastico: Un testimone della scuola Chalcedonense in Egitto al tempo del patriarca Zoilo", in: *Ricerche e studi sull'oriente cristiano* 6 (2002) (101–120) 112–118. The latter is, however, unacquainted with U.M. Lang's in most respects sufficient refutation of v. Esbroeck ("The date of the treatise *De sectis* revisited", in: *Orientalia Lovaniensia periodica* 29 [1998], 89–98). I have dealt with this issue comprehensively in my "Der Traktat *De sectis* des Abbas Theodor. Eine Handreichung zur Widerlegung der διακρινόμενοι", in: *Zweite Tübinger Tagung zum christlichen Orient: Ägypten in der Spätantiken Zeit*, ed. D. Bumazhnov e.a., Tübingen 2012 (in print). I am trying to show there on the basis of additional manuscript witnesses and an all-embracing analysis of the structure of the text that it can hardly be earlier than Eulogius, yet was left unfinished and completed later on provisionally with a secondary ending (MSG 86/I, 1264B–1268A). That this ending might actually go back to a certain Leontius the scholiast who took down the course of abbas Theodoros, to which the treatise is ascribed in the manuscript tradition (cf. M. Waegeman, The text tradition of the treatise *De sectis* [Ps. Leontius Byzantinus], in: *L'antiquité classique* 45 [1976], [190–196] 191 f.) would be a plausible accommodation of Carcione's hypothesis ("Il *De sectis*", 118–120), who wants all the material from the time after Zoilus to derive from such a secondary adaption.

³⁵¹ Cf. K.H. Uthemann, "Der Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monotheletismus. Ein Beitrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus", in: *Studia Patristica* 29, Leuven 1997, (373–413) 394–403; Helmer, *Neuchalkedonismus*, 223 f.; T. Hainthaler in Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/3, 398–400. Of course, there are also earlier treatments of the problem, like that of Ephrem of Amid (Cf. *ibid.*, 370 f.) or Severus of Antioch (Cf. Chesnut, *Three monophysite Christologies*, 25–34).

³⁵² D. Krausmüller, "Leontius of Jerusalem. A theologian of the seventh century", in: *JThS* 52 (2001), (637–657) 639–649 has convincingly refuted Richard's arguments for 543 as terminus ante quem and reassessed Loofs' arguments for 568 (the Lombards entering Italy cf. *Against the Monophysites*, 156) or 578 (death of Jacob Baradaeus, origin of the Jacobite movement cf. *ibid.* 160) as termini post quem. However, his own "new arguments" (pp. 649–656) referring

the *De sectis* in its present form, but around 570 for Pamphilus,³⁵³ we will take him as a starting point, yet in being aware that we can by no means be certain about his temporal priority.

3.5.1. *Pamphilus Reading Leontius of Byzantium*

Whereas we cannot be sure whether Pamphilus knew any of John's or Ephrem's writings,³⁵⁴ his abundant use of those of Leontius of Byzantium, who is even endowed with the title "father" (qu. VI,119f.; VIII,126), is well attested.³⁵⁵ If Declerck's latest hypothesis on Pamphilus' identity with the co-author of the letter to Agapetus I. from 536 holds, he might even have known Leontius personally.³⁵⁶ Following the great Byzantine theologian, he develops a theological approach which differs considerably from the traditional one regarding the importance of philosophy and dialectics: In defence of the Chalcedonian formula, the focus of the debate shifts from the interpretation of scriptural passages and liturgical confessions to the clarification of technical terms in their application to theological matters, taking into account both the Christian (biblical and patristic) and the pagan philosophical tradition. The first two questions of Pamphilus' *Panhoplion*³⁵⁷ provide an outstanding example of this, as the author enters the Christological debate by interpreting the Cappadocian distinction between οὐσία and

the Nestorian's example in CN III,8 1633A to the birth of the emperor Heraclius' son in 612 and Leontius' lament about the conquest of Jerusalem in VII,10 1768hC to a contemporary one, namely that of the Persians in 614, seem to press the wording of the text far too much in both cases. If Gray, however, wants to dismiss Krausmüller's entire case because of the weakness of those arguments, as the story at the end of CM is "on stylistic grounds alone" the work of the first copyist (*Against the Monophysites*, 39), he fails to reveal those stylistic reasons, which are obviously not evident for everybody, at least not for Krausmüller, me and C. dell'Osso, "Leonzio di Bisanzio e Leonzio di Gerusalemme. Una chiara distinzione", in: *Augustinianum* 46 (2006), (231–259) 248–256, who subscribes to the entirety of Krausmüller's conclusions. The similarities between *Contra Monophysitas* and Justinian's letter to the Alexandrian monks pointed out by J. MacDonald, "Leontius of Jerusalem's *Against the Monophysites* as a possible source for Justinian's *Letter to the Alexandrian monks*", in: *Byzantion* 67 (1997), 375–382 thus rather suggest a dependence of the former on the latter.

³⁵³ Cf. J.H. Declerck in his introduction to CCG 19, 24 ('about ten years after the outbreak of the tritheite controversy in 557').

³⁵⁴ Cf. *Ibid.*, 81f.

³⁵⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, 64–68.81–83. Pamphilus knew CNE, the *Epilysis* and the *Epaporemata* and made use of them mainly in qu. VI–IX. The dependence on Leontius of Jerusalem supposed by C. Moeller (cf. *ibid.*, 83f.) is now, taking into account Krausmüller's new dating, not only improbable, but impossible.

³⁵⁶ Cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/3, 158.

³⁵⁷ We will retain Cardinal Mai's title for the sake of the beautiful biblical metaphor.

hypostasis on the background of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, Aristotle's *Organon* and the commentary tradition on those works.³⁵⁸ The second question treats the terms οὐσία and φύσις in comparing their theological usage with the philosophical one and for the theological meaning of the former draws mainly on Leontius of Byzantium: From CNE 1277D and *Epilysis* 1945B he adduces the basic distinctions between substance and accidents, substantial qualities/specific differences, inseparable and separable accidents. By identifying Leontius' ποιότητες ἐπουσιώδεις with the inseparable accidents (qu. II, 41), he apparently established an adapted tradition of usage, which was handed down via the *Doctrina patrum* to John of Damascus,³⁵⁹ yet also seems to occur in Leontius of Jerusalem.³⁶⁰ In his treatment of the term φύσις, we encounter the first occurrence of ἐνυπόστατος: The term 'nature', he says, can be also referred to ἀνυπόστατα like wrath, love, time and lie, the term οὐσία, however, only to ἐνυπόστατα, which is employed here in perfectly traditional manner, as becomes clear from the parallel negation: 'nature' is said to be applied improperly both to not (independently) existing things and to those "which are perceived in their own substance and hypostasis" (κατὰ τῶν ἐν οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει ἰδίᾳ θεωρουμένων).³⁶¹ The Ephrem-excerpt in Photius (cod. 229 256b24–33) referred to above strongly suggests that this passage is also derived from a genuinely Christological

³⁵⁸ Cf. Declerck's apparatus on II, 45–104.168–205 and ab. nn. 328–335. He even had an idea about the threefold universal (cf. I.38–41) and Proclus' distinction between three kinds of wholes (V, 115f. cf. Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, prop. 67–69, ed. Dodds, 64f.). But Grillmeier's assumption of an acquaintance with Philoponus' commentary on the *Physics* (*Jesus der Christus* II/3, 145f.) is—taking into account the homogeneity of the Neoplatonic commentary tradition—highly improbable, as Pamphilus most probably knew about Philoponus' heresies. He may equally have used another commentary or attended a lecture on the *Physics* at some point.

³⁵⁹ Cf. Declerck's apparatus ad locum. M. Richard ("Léonce et Pamphile", 34.39) not only overemphasizes Pamphilus' philosophical incompetence, but also wants to construct a fundamental difference between Pamphilus' traditional, Cappadocian/Porphyrian concept of hypostasis and Leontius' very own καθ' αὐτὸ ὑφίστασθαι (Ibid. 30f.34–39). However, he makes far too much of Pamphilus' addition of καθ' αὐτὸ to Leontius' description of the οὐσία as πράγμα ὑφιστάς (qu. II, 43f.)—analogous to ἐνυπόστατος, ὑφιστάς can mean both 'real' and 'self-subsisting'—, just as he does not recognize Pamphilus' reception of our derived use of ἀνυπόστατον in qu. VII, 32–34, but claims those lines to be a failed attempt of harmonizing traditional and Leontian terminology.

³⁶⁰ Cf. esp. CN I,14 (MSG 86/II, 1453BC; with the standard Porphyrian examples 'black raven' and 'black Ethiopian') and also CN I,6 (1421A).

³⁶¹ *Panhoplion* II, 132–140 (CCG 19, 140): Τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ὄνομα φερόμενον εὐρίσκομεν καταχρηστικῶς κατὰ ἀνυποστάτων καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἐν οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει ἰδίᾳ θεωρουμένων, τὸ δὲ τῆς οὐσίας ὄνομα, κατὰ ἐνυποστάτων καὶ μόνον· οὐσίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμεν ἀνυπόστατον, φύσεις δὲ πολλὰς εὐρίσκομεν ἀνυποστάτους, καθ' ἑαυτὰς δὲ οὐσίας μηδέποτε ὑφιστάσας, ὡς θυμοῦ καὶ ἀγάπης, καὶ χρόνου καὶ ψεύδους καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν.

argument, just like the ‘Leontius-passage’ on οὐσία: In contrast to qu. VII, where we will find an exposition of the ‘no nature without hypostasis’-problem along entirely Leontian lines, this passage thus presents an echo of John the Grammarian’s solution: Christ’s human nature does not have to be ἐνυπόστατος in the strict sense, as many ἀνυπόστατα are called natures both by the philosophers and the fathers. Pamphilus, however, makes clear that he does not favour this answer to the problem in that he clearly and repeatedly characterizes this usage of ‘nature’ as κατὰχρησις (II, 133.155 f.). The only other instance of the traditional usage in qu. XI, where tritheism is rebutted by claiming that the divine hypostases are “not substance, but an ἐνυπόστατόν τι καὶ οὐσιώδες πρᾶγμα”,³⁶² will thus also be due to the traditional, trinitarian context.

The most important text for our purpose is therefore once again the refutation of the ‘no nature without hypostasis’-objection, as undertaken by Pamphilus in qu. VII. Its introductory passage reads almost like a glossed version of CNE 1277D–1280B³⁶³ and may serve as a perfect demonstration of how puzzling the exact structure of Leontius’ argument was even for his contemporary readers. Basically, Pamphilus splits the Leontian argument into two, the positive establishment of the possibility to call Christ’s two natures ἐνυπόστατοι (qu. VII, 9–40) and the polemic rebuttal of the opponent’s counterclaim that this would entail two hypostases (VII, 41–61). In the first section, he rearranges Leontius’ seemingly repetitive circulations around the difference between nature and hypostasis into two clear statements:

Firstly, there is no anhypostatic nature: Every nature subsists by itself, not in another entity, and is thus clearly to be distinguished from any kind of accident:

An anhypostatic nature, in the sense of substance, will never exist, but only an ‘enhypostatic’ one, i.e. a subsisting thing perceived in itself and not having its being in something else like the accidents. For those are perceived around the substance, as they are unable to subsist for themselves, but only together with the nature composed and grown together with them.³⁶⁴

³⁶² *Panhoplion* XI, 151–158 (CCG 19, 207): Οὐκ ἀνουσίους δὲ τὰς ὑποστάσεις δοξάζομεν ὡς πολλάκις εἴρηται—μηδεὶς τῷ λόγῳ ἐπιτρέχεται—, οὔτε δὲ οὐσίας. Εἰ γὰρ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὸ ἰδιάζον τοῦ χαρακτήρος ποιεῖ, δι’ οὗ τῶν ἐν τῇ μιᾷ οὐσίᾳ παραδεδομένων προσώπων ἡ ἰδιότης γνωρίζεται, τοῦτο δὲ οὐ πέφυκε ποιεῖν ἡ οὐσία, δηλονότι ἡ ὑπόστασις ὡς ὑπόστασις οὐκ ἔστιν οὐσία, ἀλλ’ ἐνυπόστατόν τι καὶ οὐσιώδες πρᾶγμα.

³⁶³ Cf. Richard, “Léonce et Pamphile”, 35 f.; Lang, “Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos”, 643 f.

³⁶⁴ *Panhoplion* VII, 9–15 (CCG 19, 173): Ἀνυπόστατος φύσις, τουτέστιν οὐσία, οὐκ ἂν εἴη ποτέ, ἀλλ’ ἐνυπόστατος, τουτέστι πρᾶγμα ὕφεστώς ἐν ἑαυτῷ θεωρούμενον, καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἐτέρῳ ἔχον τὸ εἶναι

Interestingly enough, he not only seems to have referred the $\delta \text{ ἐν ἐτέρω ἔχει τὸ εἶναι}$ -clause (1277D5f.) to συμβεβηκός (qu. VII, 11f.), but also displays a pretty odd reading of Leontius' final statement (1280B) in taking the phrase μετὰ τῆς συγκειμένης καὶ συμπεφυκυίας (1280B6f.) as describing the accidents (qu. VII, 14f.): If his Leontius-text was not defective at this point, he must have wrongly referred τῆς θατέρου φύσεως (1280B4f.) to οὐσίαι and οὐσιώδως κατηγορούμενα (1280B3f.), not to the divine and human nature.

Secondly, ἐνυπόστατον, i.e. nature, is sharply to be distinguished from 'hypostasis', as (a) the former signifies the universal species, the latter the concrete individual, and (b) the two terms show a fundamental difference in function:

(a) Yet, the ἐνυπόστατον, i.e. the nature, is not the same as the hypostasis, as the ἐνυπόστατον, as had been said before, signifies the substance and designates the community of the species. The hypostasis, however, makes the individual man by marking off his personal appearance by his characteristic properties and setting the individual apart from the common.

(b) Again, ἐνυπόστατον indicates the fact that the entity in question is not an accident, but is perceived in itself and in its own existence; hypostasis means that which is separate and by itself and reveals the congregation of the characterizing idioms, as it is perceived primarily in the idioms in order to mark off the individual or person from the common essence, although it is not unsubstantial.³⁶⁵

To those clarifications, Pamphilus adds a third step of his own, thus advancing his solution independently from Leontius, probably because of his obvious difficulties with understanding Leontius' text: If ἐνυπόστατα relate to ἀνυπόστατα as substance to accidents, they are privative opposita, which

ὡς τὰ συμβεβηκότα· ταῦτα γὰρ περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν θεωροῦνται, καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὑποστῆναι μὴ δυνάμενα, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς συγκειμένης καὶ συμπεφυκυίας αὐτοῖς φύσεως.

³⁶⁵ *Panhoplion* VII, 15–27 (CCG 19, 173f.): Οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ταυτὸν ἐνυπόστατον, τουτέστι φύσις, καὶ ὑπόστασις. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐνυπόστατον ὡς εἴρηται οὐσίαν δηλοῖ, καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τοῦ εἶδους σημαίνει· ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις τὸν τινὰ ἄνθρωπον ποιεῖ, πρόσωπον ἀφορίζουσα τοῖς χαρακτηριστικοῖς ιδιώμασι, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ διαστέλλουσα. Πάλιν τὸ ἐνυπόστατον τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸ συμβεβηκὸς σημαίνει, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑπάρξει θεωρούμενον· ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις τὸ διηρημένον καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὃν δηλοῖ, καὶ τὴν συνδρομὴν τῶν χαρακτηριστικῶν ιδιωμάτων ἐμφαίνει, κατὰ πρῶτον λόγον ἐν τοῖς ιδιώμασι θεωρούμενον, ἵνα τὸ ἄτομον ἀφορίσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ἢ τὸ πρόσωπον, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἔστιν ἀνούσιος. As ἐν ἑαυτῷ and καθ' αὐτό are actually used almost synonymously as opposites of ἐν ἐτέρῳ in the philosophy of late antiquity (cf. e.g. Proclus, *Elements* prop. 41 and 81; ed. Dodds, 42.44.76 / Ammonius, *In Isagog.*; CAG IV/3, 29.20f.), one can understand that Richard claims this passage to be “près de l'incohérence” (“Léonce et Pamphile”, 37).

means that everything not enhypostatic or substantial must be anhypostatic or an accident *and vice versa*. If Christ's natures, then, are not accidents or anhypostatic, they must be substances, i.e. enhypostatic.³⁶⁶

This sophisticated way of argumentation arises in my opinion exactly from the problem discussed above, i.e. the one of determining the role of the accidents or substantial qualities in Leontius' text. As the next, polemical section shows, Pamphilus faced similar difficulties with Leontius' statements about 'nature' and 'hypostasis' in 1280A: He obviously overlooked the fact that Leontius in 1280A2 had qualified the 'no nature without hypostasis'-axiom as applying only to 'nature' in the sense of 'substance'.³⁶⁷ Thus, he took 1280A1–10 to be a simple restatement of the difference between nature and hypostasis and apparently did not quite know what to make of it. Thus, he only retains Leontius' core statement as to 'hypostasis' being the more determined concept than nature.³⁶⁸ Against Leontius, he seems in this chapter (against his remarks in II, 132–140) to presuppose the synonymy between 'nature' and 'substance' without questioning it, as he has the *reductio ad absurdum* of his opponent culminate in the—equally absurd—alternative either to deny this synonymy or to end up in tritheism or sabellianism by identifying 'substance' with 'hypostasis'.³⁶⁹

³⁶⁶ *Panhoplion* VII, 28–40 (CCG 19, 174): Τούτων οὕτω διακρινηθέντων, δεῖ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐπὶ τῶν ἐναντίων καὶ ἀντικειμένων ἢ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀναίρεσις, ἀντεισαγωγὴν ποιεῖται τοῦ ἐτέρου, ὡς ἐπὶ φωτὸς καὶ σκότους· ἢ γὰρ τοῦ φωτὸς παρούσα ἀναίρεσις ποιεῖ τοῦ σκότους. Εἰ οὖν ἀντίκειται τὸ ἐνυπόστατον τῷ ἀνυποστάτῳ, ὡς οὐσία τοῖς συμβεβηκόσι, καὶ τὰ συμβεβηκότα, ἅπερ εἰσὶν ἀνυπόστατα, τῇ οὐσίᾳ, δηλονότι τῆς ἀποφάσεως ἀναιρεθείσης, τῆς ἀπαγορευούσης μὴ εἶναι τὴν οὐσίαν ἡγουν τὴν φύσιν ἀνυπόστατον, ἢ κατὰφασις εἰσάγεται ἢ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον ὑποτιθεμένη. Καὶ εὐσεβῶς ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύο φύσεις καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐνυποστάτους.

³⁶⁷ Cf. *ab.* after n. 192.

³⁶⁸ *Panhoplion* VII, 46–50 (CCG 19, 174 f.): Οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι φύσις ὑπόστασις, ὅτι μὴ δὲ ἀντιστρέφει· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ὑπόστασις, καὶ φύσις ἡγουν οὐσία δύναται εἶναι, τῷ λόγῳ διακρινόντων ἡμῶν τὰ ἰδιώματα καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν, ἢ ταῦτα πρόσσεισι, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὴν θεωρούντων· ἢ δὲ φύσις οὐκέτι καὶ ὑπόστασις.

³⁶⁹ *Panhoplion* VII, 50–61 (CCG 19, 175): 'Ο δὲ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον εἰς ὑπόστασιν συνάγων, οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἀγωνίζεται δεῖξαι, εἰ μὴ τὴν φύσιν μὴ εἶναι οὐσίαν. Ἄλλωστε δὲ εἰ ταυτὸν φύσις καὶ ὑπόστασις, ἐπεὶπερ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ φύσεως τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁμοὑπόστατος τούτῳ εἶναι προσήκει κατὰ τὸν χαρακτήρα τοῦ προσώπου. Ἀλλὰ μὴν τοῦτο τῆς ἀληθείας ὁ λόγος οὐχ ὑποβάλλει, ἐπεὶ συναλοιφῇ τῶν ὑποστάσεων εἰσάγεται, καὶ ὀνόματα ψιλὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἑστερημένα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ προσκυνητῆς τριάδος, κατὰ τὴν Σαβελλίου τοῦ Λίβυος κenoφωνίαν. Οὐκ ἄρα ταυτὸν φύσις καὶ ὑπόστασις.

3.5.2. *Complementary Neochalcedonian Arguments:
Pamphilus and the Insubstance Formula*

Thus, all Pamphilus proves by his dialectical reflections upon Leontius and his attempts to elucidate his argument is that the only possible way of applying the Neonicean trinitarian terminology to Christology is the Chalcedonian one—a point which of course had to be made by the Chalcedonians on the occasion of the recent tritheite controversy among the Monophysites. Nevertheless, Pamphilus himself was obviously not quite content with this reply and thus added yet another, thoroughly Neochalcedonian argument to his solution, namely the argument from insubstance:

Inhabiting the virgin mother, the Logos creates for himself—in an imperishable and an unperceivable way—a temple from her, a complete human being, without seed. This means: He took a certain οὐσία ἐνυπόστατος, a part of her nature, and caused it to exist as substance in his own hypostasis; and thus he came forth for us from her, the same one being both God by nature and man by nature. If he, then, did not assume a hypostasis, but a human οὐσία ἐνυπόστατος—for, as it has already been said before, the Lord's human element did not exist 'self-subsistently' (ἰδιοὑποστάτως) and by itself before the union—, our Lord Jesus Christ must neither be said to come to be from two hypostases before the union, nor is it allowed to separate those two after the union and conceive of two hypostases.³⁷⁰

³⁷⁰ Ibid. 76–88; 176: Καὶ ἐνοικησας ἐν τῇ παρθενικῇ μήτρῃ, ἀφθάρτως καὶ ἀοράτως ναὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἑαυτῷ, τέλειον ἄνθρωπον ἀσπόρως ἐδημιούργησε, τουτέστιν οὐσίαν ἐνυπόστατον τι μέρος λαβὼν τῆς ἐκείνης φύσεως, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν οὐσιώσας· καὶ οὕτως ἡμῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς προήλθε, θεὸς ὢν ὁ αὐτὸς φύσει, καὶ ἄνθρωπος φύσει. Εἰ οὖν μὴ ὑπόστασιν ἀνέλαβεν, ἀλλ' οὐσίαν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνυπόστατον—οὐδὲ γὰρ ὡς ἡδὲ εἴρηται πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοῦ κυρίου ἰδιοὑποστάτως καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὑπῆρχεν—, οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δεῖ λέγειν ἐκ δύο ὑποστάσεων πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως, ἢ διαίρειν μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν καὶ δύο ὑποστάσεις δοξάσαι. An analogous use of the same Theodoretus-passage, yet more explicit with regard to the implied 'biology of incarnation' (cf. bel. on Maximus n. 550–552) can be found in Theodore of Raithu's *Praeparatio* (ed. F. Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica. Texte und Abhandlungen zur griechischen Patristik*, Rome 1938 [OCA 117], 192,9–22): Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ ὅρος ἐναργῶς παριστὰ, μὴ ἂν ποτε ἐν ὑποστάσει τὸ καθόλου γνωσθῇ τὴν κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀνθρωπότητα, εἰ μὴ ἡ τοῦ λόγου θεικὴ φύσις ὑπεισθῇ τὴν παρθενικὴν νηδύν, ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀρρήτῳ λόγῳ ταύτην ἑαυτῇ περιεμόρφου καὶ περιέπλαττει, ὥστε μὴδὲ αὐτὰς τὰς πρώτας τῆς ζωπλαστίας ἀρχὰς ἐσχηκέναι τὴν προσληφθεῖσαν φύσιν ἄνευ τῆς οὐσιώδους καὶ φυσικῆς ἐμφιλοχωρήσεως τῆς προσλαβομένης αὐτὴν θεοῦ λόγου φύσεως. καὶ τί λέγω τὰς τῆς θεοπλαστίας ἀρχάς, ὅπουγε οὐδ' ἂν αὐτὴ ἡ μακαρία παρθένος ὑπὲρ τὸν ὅρον τῆς φύσεως γόνιμον ἔλαβε δύναμιν εἰς τὸ τεκνώσαι, μὴ διὰ τῆς ἐνδημίας τοῦ λόγου εἰς τοῦτο παρορμηθεῖσαι; πῶς οὖν αὕτη ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀνθρωπότης ἐν ἰδιαζούσῃ ὑποστάσει καθ' ἑαυτὴν οὐποτε γενομένη, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ προσλαβομένῳ αὐτὴν θεῷ λόγῳ τὸ εἶναι τε καὶ ὑποστῆναι λαχοῦσα, ὑπόστασις ἂν λεγθεῖη ποτέ, ἢ πρόσωπον ἰδιοσύστατον καθ' ἑαυτὸ καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος γνωριζόμενον ἔχοι;

Just as Ps-Athanasius in his letter to Jovianus,³⁷¹ Pamphilus wants to preclude a separate human hypostasis of Christ on the grounds that his humanity never subsisted by itself, but was substantiated exclusively in the Logos who incorporated it in his own hypostasis. However, his main source for this conception was apparently not Ps-Athanasius, to whom he alludes only briefly (qu. III, 42 f.), but Ps-Justin (Theodoretus), who says in his *Expositio fidei*:

Using the virgin, who was derived from David's lineage because of the promises to the latter, as a means for the salvific purpose, he entered her womb like a divine seed and created a temple for himself, the perfect man, by taking a certain part of her nature and substantiating it for the creation of the temple. Entering this womb according to the utmost unity, he came forth as God and man simultaneously (ὁμοῦ) and accomplished thus the dispensation toward us.³⁷²

At first sight, this has barely anything to do with what Ps-Athanasius meant: The 'divine seed' in Theodoretus is nothing but the divine power creating the perfect man Jesus as its temple from the virgin Mary, not the ontological principle of his 'hypostatization'. Yet, reminding ourselves of what we read in the source of the letter to Jovianus, the fourth pseudo-Athanasian dialogue, Theodoretus almost seems to have been taken some inspiration from this text, as both emphasize the exclusivity of the divine initiative in creating the manhood of Christ as the temple of the Logos³⁷³ and the simultaneity of the divine and human aspect in the incarnation: Theodoretus' ὁμοῦ could be assumed to echo Ps-Athanasius' ἅμα.³⁷⁴ Yet, a more detailed comparison between the two authors shows a crucial difference in their Christological stance: Where Ps-Athanasius adduces the lack of human pre-existence clearly as an explanation for the unity of Christ's existence, Theodoretus explicitly refrains from any attempt to penetrate the mystery of the

³⁷¹ Cf. ab. n. 164.

³⁷² *Expositio* 10 (*Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, ed. J.C.T. Otto, vol. 4, Jena 1880 [repr. Wiesbaden 1969], 34 f.): Μέσση δὲ παρθένῳ, ἐκ Δαυιτικῆς καταγομένη γένους διὰ τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπαγγελίας, πρὸς τὴν τῆς οἰκονομίας χρεῖαν χρησάμενος, καὶ ταύτης τὴν νηδὺν εἰσδύς οἰοῦναι τις θεῖος σπόρος, πλάττει ναὸν ἑαυτῷ, τὸν τέλειον ἄνθρωπον, μέρος τι λαβὼν τῆς ἐκείνης φύσεως καὶ εἰς τὴν τοῦ ναοῦ διάπλασιν οὐσιώσας. Ἐνδὺς δὲ τοῦτον κατ' ἄκραν ἔνωσιν, θεὸς ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπος προελθὼν, οὕτω τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς οἰκονομίαν ἐπλήρωσεν. The Christology of this entire text is analyzed by P.B. Clayton, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus. Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, Oxford 2007, 89–103.

³⁷³ Cf. ab. n. 169.

³⁷⁴ Cf. ab. n. 164.

“mode of unification”.³⁷⁵ Hence, in dealing with the question how the difference in divine presence in Jesus, the saints and the rest of the world is to be accounted for, Theodoretus dismisses every possible explanation as both aporetic and heretical,³⁷⁶ including the claim that the flesh had been “substantiated into the Logos”,³⁷⁷ which sounds very similar to what Pamphilus makes of Theodoretus here. Ps-Athanasius, in contrast, tries to solve the very same problem by emphatically underscoring the lacking preexistence of Christ’s human element and the indissoluble unity of the temple with its inhabitant in every moment of Jesus’ life,³⁷⁸ whereas Theodoretus, of course, lays strict emphasis on the remaining *divisio vocum* and *naturarum*.³⁷⁹

Despite the similarities between Theodoretus and the *Epistula ad Jovianum*, the way in which Pamphilus ‘neochalcedonizes’ Theodoretus³⁸⁰ by altering *εἰς τὴν τοῦ ναοῦ διάπλασιν οὐσιώσας* to *εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν οὐσιώσας* is thus hardly in line with what the Antiochene author originally intended.

³⁷⁵ Cf. *Expositio* 11 (ed. Otto, 36f.); 12 (ed. Otto, 44). The exposition of the two analogies following these cautelae, the anthropological one and the sunlight one, are meant to be only illustrations of how the two natures remain unconfused in the one Christ, not explanations for this unity itself.

³⁷⁶ *Expositio* 13–15 (ed. Otto, 50–58).

³⁷⁷ *Expositio* 15 (ed. Otto, 54): Εἴπατε γὰρ ἡμῖν οἱ τὸν χριστιανισμόν πρεσβεύειν σχηματιζόμενοι, οἱ ἐπ’ ἀναιρέσει τῶν δύο φύσεων τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ ζητοῦντες καὶ προισχόμενοι, οἱ τὰ τῆς κράσεως καὶ συγχύσεως καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ σώματος εἰς θεότητα μεταβολῆς καὶ τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπαπορήσεις πραγματευόμενοι, οἱ ποτὲ μὲν σάρκα τὸν λόγον γεγενῆσθαι λέγοντες, ποτὲ δὲ τὴν σάρκα εἰς λόγον οὐσιωθῆναι, καὶ διὰ τὰς τοιαύτας τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν παρατροπὰς μὴδὲ ὅτι οὖν φρονεῖτε ὅλοι καθιστάμενοι· λέγετε τοῖσιν ἡμῖν, πῶς ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γεγόμενος τοὺς οὐρανοὺς οὐ κατέλιπε.

³⁷⁸ *Dialogus* IV, 6 (ed. Capone, 80f.): Ὁρθ. Ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ Μαρίας ναὸς οὐ κενὸς ἐγεννήθη καὶ σεσαρωμένος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος, διὸ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα. οὔτε δὲ τὸν ναὸν καλῶ Ἰησοῦν χωρὶς τοῦ λόγου οὔτε τὸν λόγον χωρὶς τοῦ ναοῦ Ἰησοῦν, ἀλλ’ ἕκτοτε Ἰησοῦς ὁ λόγος κέκληται, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἰάσατο τὰ συντρίμματα τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, τότε δὲ ἰάσατο, ὅτε κατηξίωσε μορφήν δούλου λαβεῖν· οὗτος οὖν ὁ λόγος, ὁ νῦν Ἰησοῦς διὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν κληθεὶς, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα. καὶ ὡς περ τὸν καυτήρα πῦρ καὶ σίδηρον νοῶ, οὕτως Ἰησοῦν θεὸν λόγον ἐνανθρωπήσαντα. Ἀπολ. Ὁ ναὸς, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἢ ὁ ἐν τῷ ναῷ; Ὁρθ. Μὴ διαίρει τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος. εἰ γὰρ “ὁ κολλῶμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἔν πνευμά ἐστιν”, πολλῶν πλέον ὅταν ὁ κύριος λέγεται καὶ πιστεύεται ἠνώσθαι μορφήν δούλου, εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ αὐτὸς θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος.

³⁷⁹ Cf. *Expositio* 10 (ed. Otto, 36): “Ὅταν οὖν ἀκούσης περὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς υἱοῦ τὰς ἐναντίας φωνάς, καταλλῆλως μέριξε ταῖς φύσεσιν τὰ λεγόμενα, ἂν μὲν τι μέγα καὶ θεῖον, τῇ θεῇ φύσει προσενέμων, ἂν δὲ τι μικρὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπινον, τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ λογιζόμενος φύσει. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὸ τῶν φωνῶν ἀσύμφωνον διαφεύξη, ἐκάστης ἃ πέφυκεν δεχομένης φύσεως, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἕνα καὶ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων καὶ πρόσφατον κατὰ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ὁμολογήσεις.

³⁸⁰ Cf. also qu. III, 31–33 (CCG 19, 145): ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν τῇ παρθενικῇ νηδίῳ εἰσδὺς ἀφράστως καὶ ἀοράτως οἰοῖται τοῦ σπύρος, ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ὑποστάσει ἀφθάρτως πλάττει ναὸν ἑαυτῷ, τέλειον ἄνθρωπον λαβών. On Pamphilus’ general stance towards Neochalcedonism cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/3, 151–157.

Nonetheless, this reading of the passage was to prove very influential in later authors like Maximus or John of Damascus, where Theodoretus will regularly side with Ps-Athanasius as Patristic references for the insubistence-concept.³⁸¹ Pamphilus, though he tries to remain faithful to strict Chalcedonism in repeatedly calling Christ's humanity an οὐσία ἐνυπόστατος, i.e. not a hypostasis, yet a substance and by no means an accident, can be said to have promoted this reading by suggesting an ontological interpretation of Theodoretus' comparison "like a divine seed". As will become clear at least from Maximus onwards, the Neochalcedonian tradition takes the "divine seed" not as a rather unspecific metaphore for the mysterious act of divine dispensation in the holy Virgin, but in a more specific ontological sense as principle of formation and subsistence.³⁸² Small wonder that Pamphilus' usage of ἐνυπόστατος also displays Neochalcedonian traits in at least two respects: Firstly, three of the five occurrences of the term outside the Leontius-paraphrase refer it to Christ's human nature (VII,78.83; X,117); secondly, just like Leontius of Jerusalem, he contrasts it with ἰδιοὑπόστατον, a prominent term in Neochalcedonian authors like John the Grammarian, Justinian or the monk Eustathius.³⁸³

To summarize, although Pamphilus clearly did not intend a 'Loofian' interpretation (he dissociates the ἐνυπόστατον from the accident even more clearly than Leontius and touches upon the insubistence formula explicitly only once, qu. III, 32 f.), his text clearly shows and, in its reception, promoted the tendency to incorporate Leontius' impulse into the Neochalcedonian framework—a tendency to be continued especially by Maximus und John of Damascus.

³⁸¹ Cf. bel. nn. 550 and 662 f.

³⁸² Cf. bel. nn. 550–563 and 655–667. That there were similar speculations already at the end of the fifth century could be suggested by Zachary the rhetorician's description of John the Sophist, who wrote during the reign of Proterius "that as a seed God the Word materialized in the body" (*Historia ecclesiastica* III, 10; ed. E.W. Brooks, Louvain 1953 [CSCO 83], 163,25 f.).

³⁸³ John the Grammarian, *Capitula ctr. Monophysitas*; CCG 1, 64,110 / Justinian, *Contra Monophysitas* 153,20. 158,11, in: *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, ed. M. Amelotti a.a., Milan 1973, 50.52 and *Edictum rectae fidei*, in: *Ibid.*, 150,11 / Eustathius, *Epistula de duabus naturis*; CCG 19, 421,222 f. 431,547 f. It closely parallels ἰδιοσύστατον (cf. Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, col. 665b) and is often varia lectio to the latter in the manuscripts.

3.6. DE SECTIS, ANASTASIOS OF ANTIOCH AND THE CHRISTOLOGICAL DISADVANTAGES OF THE COMMON USAGE

3.6.1. De sectis, Praxis VII

The relatively short treatise *De sectis* does not offer convincing evidence to prove any kind of dependence on or acquaintance with John the Grammarian or Ephrem of Amid, even if it may have made use of Leontius' of Byzantium CNE.³⁸⁴ Despite his historical preoccupations the author also displays some philosophical learning³⁸⁵ and seems to be—dogmatically—quite rigid in his Chalcedonian stance.³⁸⁶ We will thus look in vain for any occurrence of the insubstance formula. The “ungewöhnliche Sinn für geschichtliche Entwicklungen” our author is credited with³⁸⁷ is not only displayed in the praxeis with mainly historical concern (II–VI), but also in the seventh, philosophical one we are interested in.³⁸⁸ Starting from our well-known monophysite ‘no nature without hypostasis’-objection, the author gives an adequate summary of the traditional usages³⁸⁹ of the terms ὑπόστασις, ἐνυπόστατον and ἀνυπόστατον, of course—as a strict Chalcedonian—without taking into account Neochalcedonian impulses like Ephrem's concerning ἐνυπόστατον. The equation $x \text{ ἐνυπόστατον} = \text{hypostasis of } x$ is thus his absolutely unquestionable point of departure, as it also forms the basis of the two monophysite objections—both variants of the famous aforesaid one—he expounds in his introduction:

³⁸⁴ Its Loofasian incorporation into the *Corpus Leontii* was sufficiently refuted by M. Richard, “Le traité “*De sectis*” et Léonce de Byzance”, in: *Opera minora* Vol. 2, Turnhout 1977, (695–723) 697–709, who assumes, however, a dependence on the first book of the CNE on the basis of remarkable agreements between of florilegia of CNE I and *De sectis*, Actio IX, both unpublished in Migne (ibid., 711f.)—a supposition which was confirmed by the detailed comparison between the two florilegia undertaken in the unfortunately still unpublished thesis of M. Waegeman (*Het traktaat de sectis* [Ps. Leontius Byzantinus], Gent 1982, Vol. I, 185–250). For access to this thesis I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Caroline Macé (Leuven).

³⁸⁵ Cf. MSG 86/I, 1193A. 1233B (Cat. 5). 1241D–1244B (Cat. 6; *Physics* IV, 11 219b1f.). 1244B/C (*Metaphysics* V, 6). 1244C (*Physics* I, 7 190b24).

³⁸⁶ Cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 520–523. On the contrast between this dogmatical strictness regarding any kind of Neochalcedonian compromise and the lenience in the historical judgement about the outstanding anti-Chalcedonian figures of Alexandria (especially Dioscurus and Timothy Ailuros) cf. my “Der Traktat *De sectis*” *passim*.

³⁸⁷ Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 516.

³⁸⁸ The critical text of Waegeman, *De sectis* II, 144–155 offers many ameliorations even compared to Richard's revised version of MSG 86/I, 1240C–1241A. 1241C (actio VII, 2–3) in his “*De sectis*”, 716–718.

³⁸⁹ As to the trinitarian use, ἐνυπόστατος is replaced by ἀνυπόστατος in his account of Paul of Samosata and Nestorius in Actio III, 3 (MSG 86/I, 1216A).

- (1) If the Chalcedonians assert two natures in Christ, they have to admit two hypostases.³⁹⁰
- (2) If the Chalcedonians assert two natures in Christ, those have to be either ἐνυπόστατοι or ἀνυπόστατοι. The former case entails two hypostases, the latter would make of the natures non-existing things.³⁹¹

Those objections are refuted in a merely dialectical manner at first, in pointing to the fact that they can just as well be applied to the monophysite formula “from two natures” yielding analogous absurdities as to a hypostatical preexistence of Christ’s human nature before the union.³⁹² However, our author complements this in itself unsatisfactory ἐνστάσις by an additional ἀντιπαράστασις³⁹³ in adducing the following terminological clarifications:

One has to know that the ἐνυπόστατον or hypostasis means two things. For it means that which just is, according to which meaning we also call the accidents ἐνυπόστατα, although they have their being in something else. Then it means that which is by itself, like the individuals of the substances, so that the ἐνυπόστατον by itself happens to be called ἐνυπόστατον in a twofold sense, insofar as it is and insofar as it is by itself, i.e. Peter and Paul.

Yet, there is also a twofold ἀνυπόστατον. For ἀνυπόστατον is called on the one hand that which exists nowhere and in no respect, like the goat-stag or the centaur. Again, ἀνυπόστατον is called not the (entirely) non-existent thing, but that which has its hypostasis in something else and does not subsist by itself, like the accidents.³⁹⁴

What is presented here is more or less exactly that distinction between a wider and narrower sense of ὑπόστασις/ἐνυπόστατον which we have found in John the Grammarian³⁹⁵ and which in the formulation of *De sectis* parallels

³⁹⁰ MSG 86/I, 1240A.

³⁹¹ MSG 86/I, 1240B.

³⁹² The rather odd phrase 1240B2–4 is rendered conveniently intelligible by Waegman’s reading of τὸ αὐτὸ (*De sectis* II, 146) instead of τοῦτο.

³⁹³ This is the correct reading for ἀντίστασις and ἀντιπερίστασις offered by Migne (Waegeman, *De sectis* II, 145–149). The opposition is derived from the rhetorical concept of *status* (cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, Stuttgart 1990, 64–85), where it describes the different kinds of *translatio*, i.e. how the justification of a law-suit can be called into question: either absolutely (ἐνστάσει) or in a certain respect (ἀντιπαράστασει), i.e. considering certain people or circumstances involved (cf. Hermogenes, *De statibus*, ed. G. Kowalski, Bratislava 1947, 22,9–23,5). Our author thus not only wants to deny the justification of the objection as such, but also intends to show why it does not meet the present case, i.e. Chalcedonian Christology.

³⁹⁴ Waegeman, *De sectis* II, 149–151 (MSG 86/I, 1240C–1241A). The article before ὑπόστασις in Cio has to be erased and in D6 a μηδαμῇ has to be added before μηδαμῶς.

³⁹⁵ Waegeman, *De sectis* II, 154f. (MSG 86/I, 1241C) shows even the same justification of the double use by Cyril-passages using οὐσία and ὑπόστασις synonymously (the third

even more exactly Ammonius' distinction between a wider and a narrower sense of οὐσία: Either it signifies τὸ ἀπλῶς ὄν and comprises also the accidents, *although* (καὶν) they have their existence in something else, or it signifies τὸ καθ' αὐτὸ ὄν, like individual substances.³⁹⁶ However, he attaches the analogous distinction between a general and a more specific sense of ἀνυπόστατον, which had not been thought of yet by John the Grammarian, but somehow resumes the derived use of ἀνυπόστατος we encountered in Ps-Basil:³⁹⁷ Either it signifies τὸ μηδαμῇ μηδαμῶς ὄν, like centaurs or other creatures of our fantasy, or τὸ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἔχον τὴν ὑπόστασιν and does not exist καθ' αὐτό, like the accidents.³⁹⁸ Hence, the derived sense of ἀνυπόστατος seems to coincide with Ephrem's first,³⁹⁹ Christological sense of ἐνυπόστατος, and the accidents also form the overlapping section between ἐνυπόστατος and ἀνυπόστατος in *De sectis*. Applied to Christology, this means that Christ's two natures can be called ἐνυπόστατοι only in the wider sense, ἀνυπόστατοι only in the more specific one, which is worked out in a reply carefully designed to meet the introductory monophysite dilemma:

That being so, when they will ask us: 'If you speak of two natures of Christ, do you call those ἐνυπόστατοι or ἀνυπόστατοι?', we will ask them back: 'What do you mean here by ἐνυπόστατον?' And if they say: 'in the sense of that which just is', we say that we speak of two natures of Christ in this sense, and this does not entail an absurdity for us in that it would introduce two personal appearances, as we did not employ 'hypostasis' in this sense. In order to clarify our exposition, we will alter the words and present it syllogistically and put it the following way: If there are two natures of Christ, it follows their being ἐνυπόστατοι. ἐνυπόστατος, however, means that which is. Thus, the two natures of Christ belong to the existing things.

Yet, if they say: 'We speak of ἐνυπόστατος in the sense of that which exists by itself', we say that in this sense the two natures of Christ are not ἐνυπόστατοι, but ἀνυπόστατοι. And no absurdity is entailed for us, as we do not call them ἀνυπόστατοι insofar as they do not exist, but insofar as they belong to the

anathematism in CCG 1,55,191f., the 11. chapter of the *Scholia* and the fourth anathematism in our text): "That the ecclesiastical custom knows two meanings of 'hypostasis', the one signifying that which just is, and again the one signifying the person and that which is by itself, St. Cyril makes clear, when on the one hand he says about that which just is: 'That the hypostases remain unconfused, we will know thence' and again: 'If one separates the hypostases in the case of the one Christ', and on the other hand about that which is by itself: 'Whoever attributes the sayings in the gospels to two persons or hypostases, he shall be banned'".

³⁹⁶ Waegeman, *De sectis* II, 716 (MSG 86/I, 1240C/D). Cf. ab. n. 157.

³⁹⁷ Cf. ab. nn. 161f.

³⁹⁸ Waegeman, *De sectis* II, 150 f. (1240D/1241A).

³⁹⁹ Cf. ab. nn. 340–343.

things which do not exist by themselves (οὐ καθὼς μὴ εἰσιν, ἀλλ' ὅτι τῶν μὴ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὄντων εἰσίν). And in order to clarify our exposition once again, we will alter the words and present it syllogistically: If there are two natures of Christ, it follows their being ἀνυπόστατοι. ἀνυπόστατος, however, does not mean that which is not at all, but that which is not by itself. Thus, the two natures in Christ are not by themselves.

And if we put it like this, we neither introduce two persons nor do we make them belong to the non-existing things, as we employed ἀνυπόστατος here in the sense of that which is not by itself, not yet in the sense of that which is not at all.⁴⁰⁰

There are several important things to be noticed in this passage: First of all, it shows the dialectical character of the entire argument. By no means does the author advance a theological conception of his own about how the reality of Christ's two natures might be conceived and how this would relate to Christ's one hypostasis. Whether one wants to call them ἐνυπόστατοι in the wider, unspecific or ἀνυπόστατοι in the more specific sense (a claim mostly unbearable for the later readers of *De sectis*)⁴⁰¹ entirely depends upon the opponent's choice as to how he would like to use the term ἐνυπόστατος or hypostasis. That those two terms are still understood in full synonymity is beautifully illustrated by the remark in 1241A9f. that the 'hypostasis' which immediately comes into play in using ἐνυπόστατος was in this first case not meant in its full sense, but only in the wider sense of 'whatever reality'. Thus, the line of argument also explains why there is no question of a possible insubistence of both natures or just the human nature: The author is exclusively concerned with the problem of what kind of reality is ascribed to Christ's human nature in case the two natures are to be called ἐνυπόστατοι (the unspecific one of being as such), and what kind reality is denied to them in case they are to be called ἀνυπόστατοι: the independent reality of an individual. The comparison with the accident implied in allowing the more specific sense of ἀνυπόστατος to be applied to Christ's *two* natures is hence only spelled out concerning its negative aspect (μὴ καθ' αὐτό), not concerning of the corresponding positive one (ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἔχον τὸ εἶναι). The strict Chalcedonian stance displayed by our author throughout the entire treatise gives, however, rise to the supposition that he took this strictly dialectical approach in his refutation of standard monophysite objections probably raised all over Alexandria precisely in order to avoid the typically Neochalcedonian insubistence-speculations,

⁴⁰⁰ Waegeman, *De sectis* II, 151–154 (MSG 86/I, 1241A–C).

⁴⁰¹ Cf. bel. nn. 573–576 and after n. 612.

which may have been as suspicious to him as Justinian's entire theological agenda.⁴⁰² Although our text does not provide any profound clarifications we could not come across in the authors dealt with so far, it beautifully illustrates how the Christological discussion circled around the ambiguity and formality of the concept 'hypostasis' and how important our term was in this context, and to some extent confirms our suppositions regarding the connections between the Christological discussion and the philosophical ones, mostly concerning the relationship between substance and accidents.

3.6.2. *Anastasius I. of Antioch, the Disadvantages of the Common Usage and the Systematical Problems of Insubstance-Christology*

As the following examinations finally will show, a solution of the problem along the lines of the Grammarian and *De sectis* suffers of one major disadvantage in comparison to the one Leontius of Byzantium opted for: Even if only in the wider, unspecific sense, it nevertheless has to admit two hypostases in Christ. This becomes particularly obvious in reading Anastasius of Antioch's dialogue with a tritheite, where at first sight both traditions seem to occur: On the one hand the orthodox partner explicitly states that "hypostasis is one thing, the ἐνυπόστατον another",⁴⁰³ on the other hand our term is explained as "everything that subsists, be it by itself or as having its subsistence together with another or in another entity".⁴⁰⁴ Let us analyse the text a little more closely in order to see how the patriarch intends to bring those two statements together.

The first part of the dialogue is concerned with a mainly polemical discussion of the monophysites' "one composite nature" advancing standard Chalcedonian arguments against the monophysite conception of unity and difference in Christ. In line 615, however, when the Monophysite describes the unity in Christ as "one hypostasis", the orthodox partner uses this opportunity for an exposition of the Neochalcedonian doctrine of the "one

⁴⁰² The remark about Justinian's condemnation of the three chapters in VI,6 (MSG 86/I, 1237CD) does not really sound as if he would accept or acknowledge it as a conciliar decision. He is a moderate defender of Diodore and Theodore, who went a bit too far in their anti-Apollinarian agitation (1221AB), yet absolutely convinced of the unquestionable orthodoxy of Theodoretus and Ibas (1224A–D; 1236D–1237C). His stance towards the assassination of Proterius (1228C) might suggest that despite his Chalcedonian conviction he resented the cruel Melkite 'soldier'-patriarchs' actions against the Alexandrian people (cf. J. Maspero, *Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises Jacobites* (518–616), Paris 1923, 135–181).

⁴⁰³ *Dialogue*, ed. Uthemann, 104 (l. 793f.).

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 103 (l. 779–781).

composite hypostasis”, which is, as the rest of the dialogue tries to show, the only one able to avoid the error of tritheism, the necessary consequence of the monophysite view on the relationship between nature and hypostasis. In a not very clearly structured and often circular discussion, Anastasius tries to reveal the origin of the monophysite error: the concept of individual natures (φύσεις ἰδικαί, μερικαί) and the inadequate distinction between natural and hypostatical property (ιδιότης), which inevitably leads to the twofold heresy of monophysitism and tritheism and to a fundamental self-contradiction with regard to Christ’s natural properties. In order to achieve this, Anastasius first of all has to refute the ‘no nature without hypostasis’-objection on basically the same lines as John the Grammarian: Christ’s human nature is a φύσις ἐνυπόστατος, yet not a hypostasis of its own, as it never subsisted apart from the Logos but took its subsistence in him, thus sharing the common, composed hypostasis with his godhead.⁴⁰⁵ Yet, Anastasius makes the link between the insubsistence-conception and the Cappadocian idea of hypostasis more explicit, as the fact is stressed that the Logos-initiative was the only cause for the conglomeration of those particular divine and human properties which make up the unique hypostasis of Christ.⁴⁰⁶ The monophysite’s following question, how it can be known that the Logos assumed a nature, not a hypostasis, and Anastasius’ answer, that the two natures are to be perceived from their properties, can only be understood by looking at the aforesaid aim of the dialogue: Whereas the misconceived idea of individual, concrete natures⁴⁰⁷ induces both the denial of a duality of natures in Christ and a unity of substance among the trinitarian persons,⁴⁰⁸ the postulate of a remaining difference of natural properties

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 98 f. (ll. 625–644): “A.: This very nature of man was anhypostatic? O.: By no means. A.: So you also teach the unity from two hypostases? O.: I do not postulate the impossible. A.: What is impossible about that? O.: That two hypostases are united according to the hypostasis. A.: You said that the ἐνούσιος hypostasis of the God-Logos assumed an ἐνυπόστατος οὐσία. O.: Think about how I put it and you find the truth. A.: How did you put it? I want to know the truth! O.: I said that the ἐνούσιος hypostasis of the Logos assumed the ἐνυπόστατος οὐσία of man, not as already existing, but gaining its subsistence in the Logos. It is not a hypostasis as well. A.: Then despite subsisting it is not a subsistence/hypostasis? O.: In gaining subsistence it did not receive its own hypostasis, but the common one. A.: It had nature of its own, but not a hypostasis? O.: That is right.”

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., 99 f. (ll. 650–663).

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. ibid., 100–103 (ll. 687–767), esp. the statement of the Monophysite in l. 687: “the natures are substrate-entities (ὑποκείμενα πράγματα)”.

⁴⁰⁸ This might be called Anastasius’ core theological topic, which he must have developed not only in his lost refutation of John Philoponus’ *Arbiter*, but to which he also devotes a considerable amount of space in his five sermons (Logos 1,41–44.49–71, in: *Anastasii I*

is fundamentally incompatible with this. Only in strictly distinguishing natural properties, which constitute a class membership, from individual ones, which mark off the hypostasis from other members of this class, the Christological and trinitarian dogma can be correctly and coherently spelled out.⁴⁰⁹ The most important passage concerning our term occurs within a short resumption of the ‘no nature without hypostasis’-objection which is, especially by its introduction,⁴¹⁰ marked as an excursus without a substantial contribution to the line of argument. Being asked how the concession of two non-anhypostatic natures does not entail two hypostases in Christ, the orthodox answers:

O.: The non-anhypostatic entity is a hypostasis? A.: Yet, if it is ἐνυπόστατος, is it not a hypostasis? O.: Not necessarily. A.: The ἐνυπόστατον is without hypostasis (ἀνυπόστατον)? O.: You go wrong in changing the terms. The hypostasis is one thing, the ἐνυπόστατον another. A.: What is it? O.: ἐνυπόστατον is whatever exists, a hypostasis what is perceived by itself and not together with something else or in something else. A.: I have not understood what you said. Explain it to me more clearly! O.: ἐνυπόστατος is *also* the quality in a body, like whiteness, blackness and so on, as they *exist* in the body. Yet, as it is unable to subsist on its own, it is not called hypostasis.⁴¹¹

Reading this text carefully, there can be obviously no question of a real distinction between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον nor of a real approximation of the ἐνυπόστατον to the accident. The accident can be called ἐνυπόστατον because of the fact that it exists (in whatever way), whereas the concept of hypostasis is narrowed down to independent existence, which is of course ἐνυπόστατος as well. Thus, Anastasius again makes the very same point as John the Grammarian and the *De sectis*, yet tries to avoid the consequence of admitting two hypostases in Christ in some sense by terminological stipulation—obviously not a very satisfactory solution, which will yet be echoed in the attempt of seventh and eighth-century compilers to harmonize the material concerning our term received from the tradition.⁴¹²

Antiocheni opera omnia genuina quae supersunt, ed. S.N. Sakkos, Thessaloniki 1976, 29–38 and Logos 3,29–44; ed. Sakkos, 54–57).

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. esp. *ibid.*, 105 (ll. 811–843).

⁴¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 103 (ll. 773–777). The question of the Monophysite in l. 801 clearly links up with the trinitarian question of ll. 768–772 and does not take up the clarifications concerning ἐνυπόστατος.

⁴¹¹ *Dialogue*, 104 (ll. 788–800).

⁴¹² Cf. *bel. nn.* 571–577.

Of much more interest for the later development are, however, the systematical aspects concerning insubstance-Christology and Cappadocian hypostasis-conception, which come up in this dialogue. The text shows pretty clearly that the Neochalcedonian ‘composite hypostasis’ with its two sets of heterogeneous properties suffers of at least two major problems: a Christological one, namely why (if ‘hypostasis’ is anything marked off by individual properties) the human set of properties should not make up a human hypostasis distinguished from the Logos, and a trinitarian one, namely how such a conglomeration can be reconciled with the simplicity and unalterability of the second trinitarian person as such. The first problem had already been discussed in Leontius’ of Byzantium *Epilysis*, who had tried to solve it by pointing to the fact that neither his natural, common properties nor his accidental, individual ones as such mark him off from any other individual and thus constitute his hypostasis, but only the actual configuration of the latter, i.e. the unique sum of divine and human properties to be found only in Christ and nobody else.⁴¹³ The second problem will receive its most questionable solution in Leontius of Jerusalem who allows for the human properties to enter also the trinitarian relations marking off the second person from the two other ones.⁴¹⁴ As to Anastasius, he makes the reader wait without presenting a proper solution until the very last page of the dialogue, where he actually can be said to solve both problems together:

The substance is indivisible and every member of the same species participates in it equally, not everyone partially, but all of them completely, as the individual man has the whole substance. If Peter, then, goes—for example—fishing, suffers this or does that, Paul and the rest of people do not necessarily do or suffer the same. Then, move on to the son of God. He is the only one to be the son, consubstantial with the father. As to his substance he is God, just as the Father and the Holy Spirit. As to his hypostasis, however, he is son, which is his property exclusively. It is this property he keeps up in becoming flesh, as he is son before eternity and remained son when he was made

⁴¹³ Cf. esp. *Epilysis* 1945BC (“the conglomeration of which, they say, can be verified with regard to nobody else”). The other relevant texts are presented and—in many respects questionably—analysed by R. Cross, “Individual natures in the Christology of Leontius of Byzantium”, in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10 (2002), 245–265. On the problem in general cf. also J. Zachhuber, “Individuum und Individualität in den theologischen Debatten der Spätantike”, in: *Individualität. Genese und Konzeption einer Leitkategorie humaner Selbstdeutung*, ed. W. Gräßl/L. Charbonnier, Berlin 2012 (forthcoming).

⁴¹⁴ Cf. bel. n. 479. In contrast, theologians like Eulogius of Alexandria strictly refused the admission of any kind of composition within the trinity and did not even allow the Cappadocian definition of hypostasis to be properly applied to it (apud Photium cod. 230 279b12–280b36; ed. Henry V, 44–51).

flesh without leaving this property behind. This is why it was only possible for him to be engendered in a second generation, as he was son and became son again.⁴¹⁵

If the hypostasis of Christ is constituted exclusively and entirely by the property of ‘sonship’, this provides both an answer to the question why the individual characteristics of Jesus do not mark off his human hypostasis against his divine one, and maintains in some way the immutability of the second trinitarian person, who then always was and always will be characterized and constituted by nothing but the property of sonship. Of course, this would only work out properly if Christ’s eternal and Christ’s temporal sonship could be shown to be identical in some way—a point which is, as far as I see, not really dealt with properly in Anastasius. We will thus have to expect Maximus’ reassessment of the problem in terms of the logos-tropos-distinction in order to see to what extent Neochalcedonian theology was able to provide more satisfactory answers to those questions.

3.7. LEONTIUS OF JERUSALEM

Having re-dated Leontius, the author of the *Contra Monophysitas* (CM)—in its present form probably just two appendices left from a larger treatise against the Monophysites⁴¹⁶—and the voluminous *Contra Nestorianos* (CN), Richard’s prosopographical suppositions concerning our monk (partially refuted already by D.B. Evans) are definitely surpassed.⁴¹⁷ Thus, all we can know about his relationship to our previous authors has to be inferred from his works. In the florilegium of CM he quotes from Severus’ *Contra impium grammaticum* and introduces the quotation as coming from “the same Severus, from his book against the Grammarian John, bishop of Cesarea”, the first evidence of the confusion of the Grammarian with John Khozibites, bishop of Cesarea at the time of Severus, which makes an

⁴¹⁵ *Dialogue*, 108 (ll. 908–919). Cf. *Logos* 3,21f. (ed. Sakkos, 52): “Even though there are two natures from which he was united in order to reveal the mystery, it was yet one hypostasis. For the property (ἰδιώμα) of the hypostasis remained the same also when the Son became flesh, as he is again Son also according to the flesh. Thus, the assumer differs from the assumed in nature, but never in hypostasis”.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. Richard, “Léonce de Jérusalem”, 38f.; Helmer, *Neuchalcedonismus*, 203; Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 287. As the reference in CN II,14 1565C most probably points to CM, the latter is the earlier work.

⁴¹⁷ “Léonce de Jérusalem”, 81–88 cf. Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium*, 156–183 and ab. n. 352.

intimate knowledge of the Grammarian's or Severus' work improbable.⁴¹⁸ An acquaintance with Leontius of Byzantium was supposed on the grounds of a text quoted in CN II,13 which will be discussed in detail below.⁴¹⁹ Leontius was sometimes credited with outstanding knowledge of philosophy and natural sciences,⁴²⁰ sometimes accused of infertile scholasticism and quasi-scientific sophistry.⁴²¹ Of special interest for our purposes is the acquaintance with the philosophical discussion of ἐν τινι he displays in several passages of CN.⁴²² After all, Leontius seems to be the most inventive of our authors concerning both hypostasis- and insubsistence-language.⁴²³

3.7.1. *Leontius' Usage of ἐνυπόστατος*

Nevertheless, at first sight his use of ἐνυπόστατος does not show any kind of peculiarities whatsoever. That our well-known equation also holds for him, is already shown by the very first occurrence of the term in CN, where it figures merely as the adjective that corresponds to the basic meaning of ὑπόστασις. This *prima facie* quite obscure passage reads:

Thus, we say that 'hypostasis' is called by some Greeks more ancient in their manner of speech the sediment or yeast of the wine and such liquids, because they show their στάσις in having settled down *under* the liquid floating above, in which sense we speak of ἐνυπόστατα σημεῖα.⁴²⁴

⁴¹⁸ MSG 86/II, 1848D cf. M. Richard in CCG 1, V.

⁴¹⁹ The similarities mentioned by Loofs in order to establish his "Grundschriftypothese" are not even close enough to establish any kind of acquaintance between the two authors (cf. Richard's discussion in "Léonce de Jérusalem", 69–73). Otto's revisitation of those similarities (*Person und Subsistenz*, 89–133) does not prove more than the non-incompatibility of those two authors' anthropology. However, he convincingly refutes Richard's ("Léonce de Jérusalem", 60–62) and C. Moeller's ("Textes 'Monophysites' de Léonce de Jérusalem", in: *ETHL* 27 [1951], [467–482] 472 f.) suggestion that Leontius—though not consistently—dismisses the Cappadocian definition of hypostasis (*Person und Substistenz*, 100–103.118 f.133).

⁴²⁰ Richard, "Léonce de Jérusalem", 52–58; Helmer, *Neuchalkedonismus*, 204.

⁴²¹ C. Moeller, "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI siècle", in: Grillmeier/Bacht, *Chalkedon I*, (637–720) 687 (CN "illisible"); Gray, *Defense*, 123.

⁴²² He knows about the difference of ἐν τινι ὡς συμβεβηκός and ὡς μέρος (CN I,6; MSG 86/I, 1421A–C; II,49 1601B), the πολλαχῶς λέγεσθαι of this expression (I,8 1433 A), claims that the phrase generally signifies a ἔνωσις (II,9 1553D) and especially reflects upon the wide range of meaning of the prefix ἐν (II,4 1537D/1540 A): "If the appearance of the word persuades that the ἐνούσιον is part of an οὐσία, one would conclude, as a thing is also called ἐντόπιον, that it is a part of space. And as some kind of animal is called ἐνὸδριον, this animal would thus be part of the water".

⁴²³ Cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 297–302.

⁴²⁴ CN II,1 1528D. Neither the Marcianus graecus 67, fol. 336^r24 nor the Monacensis graecus 6, fol. 107^v5 display the superfluous κατὰ in 1528D2. For the access to the former, most important, manuscript, I would like to thank Dr. Matthieu Cassin, IRHT.

I am not quite sure what Lampe was thinking of when he interpreted our term as “subsistent in, established in the very nature, inherent” in this passage.⁴²⁵ In my opinion, the most natural understanding would be to interpret the text in the light of the common medical practice of diagnose from sediments in diverse body-liquids, as expounded e.g. in the treatise *De signis ex urinis* ascribed to Galen,⁴²⁶ and translate something like “hypostatic, i.e. sedimental, signs”.

The same treatment of the term simply as the adjective corresponding to ‘hypostasis’, recurs in other passages, especially IV,36, where φύσις ἐνυπόστατος—in a commutatio⁴²⁷—parallels φυσική ὑπόστασις⁴²⁸ and VII,1, where it is claimed that we perceive the complete divinity in all three hypostases of the trinity, ἐνουσίως κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν καὶ ἐνυποστατῶς κατὰ τὸ ἰδικόν.⁴²⁹ The remaining occurrences are more or less explicitly connected with a refutation of the ‘no nature without hypostasis’-objection, which once again barely leaves any room for the first two kinds of usage we encountered in the Grammarians.⁴³⁰ With only one exception—V,28, a resumption of earlier

⁴²⁵ *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. A 5 (485b).

⁴²⁶ Cf. P. Moraux, “Anecdota Graeca minora VI: Pseudo-Galen, de signis ex urinis”, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 60 (1985), (63–74) 68–74. A survey on the relevant medical tradition from the Hippocratean Prognosticon onwards can be found *ibid.*, 65–67.

⁴²⁷ Cf. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 395–397 (§§ 800–803).

⁴²⁸ The chapter argues against the Nestorian objection that the incarnation according to the Chalcedonians would imply an alteration of the Logos drawing on the similes of a gilded piece of wood and an armed man: “If the gold which is according to its φύσις ἐνυπόστατος gilded is still goldless according to its nature, and the man is still unironed, or better just covered with hair according to his nature, who is according to his φυσική ὑπόστασις an ironed soldier or woolen at his peak (helmet), also the Logos remains fleshless according to his nature, i.e. his substantial Logos, yet is covered with the flesh supervening his natural hypostasis. For the natural immutability is perceived in the substantial definitions, not in the things supervening the substance, but in those the nature remains identical and the additional consideration concerning the hypostasis takes place” (1704D).

⁴²⁹ Leontius deals with the Nestorian objection against the theopaschite formula that speaking of “one of the Holy Trinity” as suffering would entail tritheism: “Also our holy fathers and the sacred Scripture did by no means mind discussing every single one of the trinitarian persons on its own. They referred to Father and to the Son in the masculine in a host of places, as they perceived the all-perfection of every single one of them substantially according to the common and hypostatically according to the individual aspect, the same perfection of godhead and lordship in all three of them” (1760B).

⁴³⁰ Cf. *ab. nn.* 141–144. Leontius prefers ὑποστατικώς both in the trinitarian context (cf. CN I,19 1481B12; II,24 1585D; VII,5 1768aC) and with respect to Christ’s hypostatic union (cf. I,46 1504D; I,50 1512B–1513A; II,12 1557D; II,30 1589B; III,2 1609A; III,5 1616A.1617A; V,1 1724B; VII,7 1768eC).

arguments⁴³¹—they are concentrated in book II, which is directed against the Nestorian doctrine of two hypostases in Christ. The Nestorian's point of departure is that hypostasis means something ἐνούσιον only if it refers to an individual substance. If this sense of hypostasis is to be applied to the Chalcedonian definition, there is no room for a twofold consubstantiality of Christ, as the latter presupposes two ἐνούσια.⁴³² The vast majority of the Nestorian objections in CN II are nothing but variations of this first one. In II,5, the Nestorian argues against the possibility of an ἀνυπόστατον, i.e. the human nature of Christ which does not have a hypostasis of its own, to be consubstantial with an ἐνυπόστατον, i.e. our human natures, every one of which does have a hypostasis:

If the hypostasis you postulate is partly consubstantial with the Father and partly consubstantial with David, say whether those parts according to which it is consubstantial with the Father and David, are God and man or something else? If they are something else, tell us what this is. If they are God and man, would the man not have a hypostasis of his own next to David, with whom he is consubstantial, as also the God-Logos has a hypostasis of his own next to the Father, with whom he is consubstantial? For one would not call the ἀνυπόστατον consubstantial with the ἐνυπόστατον. In this case, if there is one hypostasis of the God-Logos, complete and consubstantial with the Father, the man from our midst is either ἀνυπόστατος and just spoken of in bare words, or ἐνυπόστατος and himself having a complete hypostasis as a man. Yet, if he is ἀνυπόστατος, it is quite strange that he should be consubstantial with David, as nothing ἀνυπόστατον can stand as consubstantial with an ἐνυπόστατον. If he is ἐνυπόστατος, he will be justly called consubstantial with David, as in general a hypostasis is only consubstantial with a hypostasis.⁴³³

⁴³¹ The objection here is that the flesh being neither transformed into the godhead nor completing its substance like a specific difference would also have to be a proper, independent man. Leontius answers: "The nature of the flesh is truly fleshly and the one of manhood as such is truly human. Yet, those are not individual hypostases, nor do any of those things subsist separately in Christ. For also in every other simple man one does not perceive the nature of man as such, but the respective nature of this individual as ἐνυπόστατος. And nevertheless neither the flesh simply because of being called flesh is separated from the soul by a proper hypostasis nor the soul from the flesh. Thus, the exposition of the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord teaches this and demands the following faith from us: The Logos surrounded his own hypostasis, which preexisted the human nature and was fleshless before eternities, with flesh and caused to exist within his very own hypostasis itself the human nature, not of an ordinary man" (1748CD).

⁴³² CN II,1 1526C–1528D. The Nestorian quotes Ps. 88,48 LXX, not 104,4. ἡ ὑπόστασις must of course be part of the quotation!

⁴³³ MSG 86/II, 1540AB. A beautiful parallel is to be found in Henanisho's refutation of Isaiah of Tahal, a pupil of the 'neochalcedonizing' Henana of Adiabene, published in Abramowski's *Nestorian collection*, Vol. 2, 101–106. Cf. also the third 'Nestorian' chapter (ibid., 109).

Leontius firstly reminds his opponent that, given the natures are to conceived of as parts, no part of a whole is *ἰδιοὑπόστατον*,⁴³⁴ i.e. a hypostasis of its own, but “is perceived in the hypostasis of the whole” (1540C). Afterwards, he—still perfectly in line with his understanding of *ἐνυπόστατον* as hypostatic—makes clear that hypostatical independence is not a material property an individual could share with another one of the same nature, but merely the formal distinction setting it apart from every other individual of his species and all other species:

The hypostasis of Christ’s natures shows him as both partly non-consubstantial and consubstantial with both of them, yet in his unique description as a whole it displays him as hypostatically different (*ἐτεροὑπόστατον*) from all other beings. For the very same unique *ἐνυπόστατον πρόσωπον* of his is able to proclaim him consubstantial with two *ἐνυποστάτοις προσώποις* and non-consubstantial according to their respective definition, as the hypostasis is not called consubstantial or non-consubstantial as such, but *qua ἐνούσιος*.⁴³⁵

Being a hypostasis, *ἐνυπόστατος*, hypostatically realized or independent as an individual, means thus one and the same thing for Leontius, first of all the pure fact of independent existence which is basically the same for the Father (1540D2), Christ and his two natures, as it is one and the same for the entirety of an individual and its parts or components. In II,35, Leontius underscores this conclusion using the example of the *ἐνυποστάτων ζῶων καὶ βοτάνων φύσεις*, i.e. the natures of individual animals and plants, which are transferred into other hypostases by consumption and digestion, just as the human *φύσις ἀπρόσωπος* of Christ is received into the ‘other’ hypostasis of the Logos.⁴³⁶

Although this entails an understanding of ‘hypostatical reality’ similarly formalized as in Leontius of Byzantium (several substantial parts of an individual can participate together in its independent reality just as in any other of its attributes), no trace of a connection between our term

⁴³⁴ For this term cf. II,10 1556A; V,29 1749C and ab. n. 383.

⁴³⁵ MSG 86/II, 1544AB.

⁴³⁶ MSG 86/II, 1593B–D: “If somebody claims that he is unable to carry another nature in himself, neither will the persons of our current fleshly nature receive in the upcoming resurrection the spiritual nature, but will have either other hypostases or neither the better natures. If, however, only God is the cause of nature and hypostasis, what should prevent him from transferring a nature into another hypostasis or one hypostasis into another nature, as everything is truly possible to him? In fact, we also see the natures of hypostatical animals and plants clearly being transferred into other hypostases, by which the nourished entities are nourished, and the hypostases into other natures, as in the case of the worms which grow into flying insects”.

and the insubsistence formula nor of a distinction between ἐνυπόστατον and hypostasis could be detected so far. The latter finally appears in II,13, and—surprisingly—within a quotation from the Nestorian. This is not only the most important chapter in Leontius with regard to our term, but also one of the most difficult ones to interpret. Following David Evans, Patrick Gray has suggested that the opponent in this chapter is not the Nestorian, but Leontius of Byzantium.⁴³⁷ The implausibility of this sudden change of opponent was already stressed by Uthemann, whose first analysis of the text is the most appropriate one so far.⁴³⁸ L. Abramowski suggests a distribution of the text which became a commonly shared opinion among researchers: She assumes two Nestorian passages marked by the φασίν in 1560 A7 and B8 and an orthodox interruption marked by the φαμέν in B1.⁴³⁹

However, neither the postulate of an interruption⁴⁴⁰ nor the ascription of those passages to the Nestorian is tenable. In fact, the whole passage 1560A7–B15 is a quotation in a quotation, i.e. a Chalcedonian text criticized by the Nestorian whose statements can be found in A4–7 and C1–D13. As already Uthemann noticed,⁴⁴¹ this is proven by 1561C9–12, where Leontius refers to the Nestorian's statement in 1560D11–13 as “what was said by you at the end”. In 1561A1–3 Leontius explicitly admits that the Nestorian is really targeting proper Chalcedonian arguments (ἡμετέρα προβλήματα), but blames his refutation for being too superficial to convince anybody except himself. Hence, the section from the Nestorian refuted here by Leontius is arguing against the following Chalcedonian statement:

We call the substances ἐνυπόστατοι ourselves, they say, but if something is ἐνυπόστατον, it is not (immediately) a hypostasis as well, just as if something is ἐνούσιον, it is not (immediately) a substance. For obviously we say that there are three hypostases of the holy Trinity and those ἐνούσιοι, but we do

⁴³⁷ Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium*, 139–143 / Gray, *Defense*, 128 f.

⁴³⁸ “Das anthropologische Modell der hypostatischen Union. Ein Beitrag zu den philosophischen Voraussetzungen und zur innerchalkedonischen Transformation eines Paradigmas”, in: *Kleronomia* 14 (1982) (215–312) 261–263. Afterwards he unfortunately changed his mind (Cf. “Definitionen und Paradigmen”, 111 n. 5).

⁴³⁹ “Ein nestorianischer Traktat bei Leontius von Jerusalem”, in: III. Symposium Syriacum (1980). Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1983, (43–55) 43 f. n. 5 cf. 52.

⁴⁴⁰ Not only A14–B7, but also B13f. clearly argue for the possibility of two natures in one hypostasis. The φαμέν of B1 does not introduce a new speaker, as the Nestorian also quotes his opponent's φαμέν in A8. The repetition of φασίν in B8 probably just characterizes the following Chalcedonian argument as additional.

⁴⁴¹ “Anthropologisches Modell”, 263 n. 38.

not speak of three substances in addition to the three hypostases, although we understand each of the hypostases as something ἐνούσιον. If it is therefore admittedly possible to speak of three ἐνούσιοι hypostases in one substance, it is obviously also possible to speak of two ἐνυπόστατοι natures in one hypostasis. And thus we neither speak of a φύσις ἀνυπόστατος nor do we teach the two natures to be two hypostases, just as we neither call the hypostases of the holy Trinity ἀνούσιοι nor separate the three hypostases in three substances.

However, they say, also otherwise, when we call a body ‘encoloured’, we know that this body is not identical with the colour, as something is not immediately a colour, if it is encoloured. Accordingly, something is not immediately a hypostasis, if it is ἐνυπόστατον. Hence, they say, the objection is superfluous, and those who speak of two natures do not necessarily have to admit them to be either ἀνυπόστατοι or actually one or by all means also two hypostases, as the ἐνυπόστατον is not a hypostasis, as we have shown.⁴⁴²

The Nestorian’s Chalcedonian opponent—provoked by his audience to demonstrate the existence of a φύσις ἀνυπόστατος—firstly postulates a difference between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον analogous to that of οὐσία and ἐνούσιον, which has to be admitted with absolute necessity if one wants to maintain the trinitarian dogma in its Neonicene version (1560A): As three hypostases ἐνούσιοι in one ousia have to be admitted, it must also be possible to conceive of two φύσεις ἐνυπόστατοι in one hypostasis. Secondly, he resumes Leontius’ of Byzantium physical analogy:⁴⁴³ Just as a body can be ἐγχρωμάτιστον, but does not have to be a χρώμα for that reason, a nature can be ἐνυπόστατος, but does not have to be a hypostasis. Thus, the postulate of two natures in one hypostasis does not entail that one or even both of them are ἀνυπόστατος (1560B). Those two arguments are rebutted by the Nestorian in inverse order: Firstly, he dismisses the physical analogy by emphasizing that a φύσις ἐνυπόστατος necessarily presupposes the presence of a hypostasis, just as a coloured body presupposes that of a colour.⁴⁴⁴ Secondly, he (correctly) exposes the nicely sounding statement about ἐνούσιον and ἐνυπόστατα as a sophistic play on words: things different in nature or species are a fortiori also hypostatically different, but never vice versa. The

⁴⁴² MSG 86/II, 1560A–C.

⁴⁴³ Cf. ab. n. 190.

⁴⁴⁴ MSG 86/II, 1560C: “If the nature corresponds to the body and to the colour the hypostasis, and they call the natures ἐνυπόστατοι just as they call the bodies en-coloured, there has to be, wherever there is an ἐνυπόστατος nature, also a hypostasis, just as there is also colour, wherever there is an en-coloured body. For an ἐνυπόστατος nature without a hypostasis is impossible to conceive”.

Chalcedonian should thus have presented a proper instance of this illogical configuration in order to substantiate his case.⁴⁴⁵

Leontius in turn follows the Nestorian's order by refuting his arguments one after the other: In his reply to the second point, he does not come back to the meaning of our term at all, but advances two pretty sophistical arguments concerning the relationship between nature and hypostasis (1561D–1564A; 1564BC) and finally presents instances such as demanded by the Nestorian, mostly of very questionable nature:

This entire world and most entities in it expose the incoherence of your opinion clearly and by the facts themselves. For if there is not one hypostasis in this concrete body of say a plant which is composed of the four natures of the elements, one hypostasis of this alloy mixed together from different natures, one hypostasis of man united from different natures, one hypostasis of this temple, one hypostasis of the drug and one hypostasis of this entire world consisting of different natures, we call the man, the plant, the world or any of the things which are called thus falsely one [...], as we then no longer have any basis to address any kind of natural compound in the singular.⁴⁴⁶

As to the first point (1561A–D), he correctly emphasizes that the mere presence of colour or of a hypostasis does not entail the identification of body and colour or nature and hypostasis respectively. The Nestorian should have shown that the presence of several different φύσεις ἐνυπόστατοι necessarily presupposes the presence of different hypostases corresponding in number. Just as different bodies can be coloured by one and the same colour 'white', different natures can subsist in one and the same common hypostasis and thus be all together ἐνυπόστατος:

⁴⁴⁵ MSG 86/II, 1560D: "If things are distinguished by nature, they are necessarily also distinguished by hypostasis. They ought to show me something which differs in nature, yet does not in hypostasis, and stop beguiling the simpler people by misleading them with the similarity of phrases in that they claim: 'If there is an ἐνούσιος, yet not ἑτεροούσιος hypostasis, there is also an ἐνυπόστατος, yet not ἑτεροϋπόστατος nature'. For the latter is false, because if something is of different nature, it is necessarily also of different hypostasis. If then the two natures are different, they differ according to nature and obviously also according to hypostasis. And if, in the case of one nature, it is impossible to speak of a difference of natures, it is also impossible to speak of a difference of hypostases [i.e. ἐνυπόστατα; B.G.] in the case of one and the same hypostasis".

⁴⁴⁶ MSG 86/II, 1564D–1565A. The text in 1565A is—as presented in Migne—clearly defective, as the absolute genitive in A3f. is isolated from the surrounding sentences. On the cosmos as one hypostasis cf. already CN I,6 (1421C–1424D), where the claim is refuted that every part of a hypostasis has to suffer together with any other.

You have not established the crucial point on which you also disagree with us: that, where several encoloured bodies are said to come together, their colours are necessarily of the same number (ἰσάριθμα) as them, and that it is not possible to colour several bodies using the very same colour, e.g. a mixture of snow, milk and white lead, or white wool, flax and raw silk woven into one white sheet; or that several bodies are mingled into one different colour, like the white lead, yellow ochre, vitriole and gummy in the grey eye-salve. For we say that the two natures subsist in one and the same hypostasis, not as if one of them could be anhypostatic in it, but because both of them subsist in one, common hypostasis, and thus both of them are ἐνυπόστατοι according to one and the same hypostasis.⁴⁴⁷

This reasoning is backed up by an additional, but similar argument: Being something, 'hypostatic' for example, is not necessarily identical with being that independently and on one's own (ἰδίᾳ) (1561B), just as a household is not without a head simply because it does not have one of its own. Hence, the natures' being ἐνυπόστατοι does not necessarily entail them being ἑτεροῦπόστατοι,⁴⁴⁸ but they have their being ἐνυπόστατοι in one common hypostasis. Thus, two ἐνυπόστατα do by no means introduce a duality of hypostases into the one hypostasis of our Lord, but only two sets of hypostatic idioms (i.e. divine and human idioms characterizing the unique hypostasis) (1561C),⁴⁴⁹ i.e. a synthesis not of hypostases, but of natures:

For, if something has to be something else, it does not necessarily have to be that on its own, as also among the households in a city none of it is without head. Yet, not every head-governed person necessarily has one single head, as they are also many in the city under a common head. Likewise, as the natures are, they also have to subsist and be ἐνυπόστατος. But as they are not independently (ἰδίᾳ) of one another, as admittedly a unity between the two has taken place, it is not necessary that each of them subsists independently. Therefore it is obvious that the ἐνυπόστατον of both of them does not have to be in different hypostases (ἑτεροῦπόστατον), but has to be perceived in one and the same hypostasis.

Thus, we accept what was said by you at the end, that it is impossible to speak of a difference of hypostases in the case of one and the same hypostasis, as we do not at all speak of a difference of hypostases in the case of the

⁴⁴⁷ MSG 86/II, 1561AB.

⁴⁴⁸ In Leontius of Jerusalem, this term is formed in analogy to ἑτεροούσιον and means "different in hypostasis" (cf. II,5 1540D.1544 A), not "having a different hypostasis" as in the commentators who derive it from ἀϋθυπόστατος (cf. David, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/2, 168,21–24 / Elias, *In Cat.*; CAG XVIII/1, 162,1f.).

⁴⁴⁹ For Leontius' conception of the "more composite idiom" (CN I,20 1485D) cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 305–311; Uthemann, "Definitionen und Paradigmen", 113 f.

one hypostasis of the Lord. Never! Yet, we know of a difference between the hypostatic individual properties. For we do not claim a unity of different hypostases, i.e. differences (between individuals), in the case of the Lord.⁴⁵⁰

The very last statement gives rise to the question how Leontius of Jerusalem solved the problem we encountered in Anastasius' antitritheite dialogue,⁴⁵¹ namely why (on Cappadocian premises) those two sets of hypostatical idioms do not make up two hypostases—a question to be answered shortly when we examine Leontius' use of the insubsistence formula. As to his usage of the term ἐνυπόστατος, it seems to denote any kind of hypostatical reality without further specifications. The distinction between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον is at any rate not genuine to the thought of Leontius, but enters his argumentation via the Nestorian's reply to Chalcedonian arguments, which were themselves obviously dependent upon Leontius of Byzantium. This Chalcedonian probably took over Leontius' parallel between the 'no nature without hypostasis'-objection and the 'no body without (shape or) colour'-axiom⁴⁵² in a simplified version (i.e. without discussing the relation between 'insubstisting natures' and substantial qualities) and elaborated the correspondence ἐνυπόστατον/ἐνούσιον in a way similar to Pamphilus by emphasizing the need for a terminologically unified approach to the trinitarian and Christological dogma. Leontius of Jerusalem, however, apparently did not attach much importance to his namesake's terminological distinction, as he never comes back to it in dealing with the 'nature without hypostasis'-objection elsewhere.⁴⁵³ The parallel between the 51st aporia of CM⁴⁵⁴ and CN II,13 (1561 A/B; 1564A) shows what for him is the crucial point: Real, individual natures do not have to be ἰσαριθμοί with the hypostases they are perceived in,⁴⁵⁵ and the natures' being οὐκ ἀνυπόστατα by no means entails their being ἰδιοὑπόστατα.⁴⁵⁶

⁴⁵⁰ MSG 86/II, 1561B–D.

⁴⁵¹ Cf. ab. n. 415.

⁴⁵² The replacement of σχῆμα by χρώμα could be inspired by Leontius' mention of colour as an example of the accident in 1277D10. The philosophical parallels (cf. ab. n. 190) regularly mention colour as well, but do not parallel ἀσχημάτιστον with ἀχρωμάτιστον (Dexippus and Simplicius, *In Cat.*: ἄχρουν; Hermeias and Simplicius, *In Cael.*: ἀχρώματον). Thus, the Chalcedonian author is most probably imitating Leontius' phrasing, just as Ps-Maximus was doing several decades (?) later on (Cf. Opusculum 23a; MSG 91, 261C/264D) and bel. n. 510.

⁴⁵³ Cf. esp. CN II,14 (1565A–1568D). 18f. (1576D–1580C). 23 (1534D/1535A).

⁴⁵⁴ *Against the Monophysites*, 210.

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. also CN II,5 (1541B.44B) and already John the Grammarian, *Cap. 11 ctr. monoph.* (CCG 1, 64,122–124): "Ὅσαι ἂν ὡσι φύσεις ἐνυποστάτως διηρημέναι, ἐν ἰσαριθμοῖς προσώποις θεωροῦνται. Ὅσαι δ' ἂν ὡσι φύσεις ἐνυποστάτως ἡνωμέναι, ἐν ἐνὶ προσώπῳ θεωροῦνται.

⁴⁵⁶ Cf. passages referred to ab. n. 434.

3.7.2. *Leontius and the Insubsistence Formula*

Examining Leontius' use of the insubsistence formula, the frequent occurrences of both *ὑφίστασθαι ἐν*⁴⁵⁷ and synonymous phrases like *(ἐν)υπάρχειν*, *(ἐν)εἶναι*, *(ἐν)θεωρεῖσθαι ἐν*⁴⁵⁸ prove that we are dealing with one of Leontius' central Christological formulas. However, two of the passages speaking of insubsistence in connection with the term *ἐνυπόστατος* (both from CN II,13) clearly hold both natures to subsist in the hypostasis of the Logos:

For we say that the two natures exist in one and the same hypostasis, not as if one of them could be *ἀνυπόστατος* in the latter, but because both can exist in one common hypostasis, and thus each of them is *ἐνυπόστατος* according to one and the same hypostasis. (1561B)

Obviously both natures must not belong to different hypostases, but their being *ἐνυπόστατον* must be perceived in *(νοεῖσθαι ἐν)* one and the same hypostasis. (1561C)

A third, similar passage can be found in V,28, where Leontius argues against the objection that, if the flesh preserved its nature without being transformed into the godhead, the very same preservation of nature should apply to the man Jesus. In his reply, Leontius points to a distinction which was apparently self-evident to him though fiercely denied by authors like Anastasius of Antioch:⁴⁵⁹ An individual nature is by no means necessarily identical with a hypostasis. Just as in every ordinary man we perceive as *ἐνυπόστατος* an individual soul and an individual body without distinguishing two separate hypostases, faith also teaches us in the case of Christ "that the Logos dressed himself with flesh in the last days and caused the human nature, not of an ordinary man, to subsist in his very own hypostasis".⁴⁶⁰ Leontius also transforms the insubsistence formula into a composite verb *ἐνυφίστημι* elsewhere and uses it both in the active ("cause to exist

⁴⁵⁷ CN I,39 1500C; I,47 1505D; II,7 1552D/1553 A; II,9 1553C; II,13 1561B; II,17 1568 A; II,22 1584D; II,47 1600C. Leontius knows the technical sense of this formula signifying the ontological status of the accident (cf. II,8 1553B) and considers the accident according to the philosophical tradition as improper being (IV,9 1668C/D). Thus, his Christological application to Christ's human nature is probably due to a well established tradition from the Apollinarian literature onwards.

⁴⁵⁸ CN I,30 1496C/D; I,52 1524B; II,5 1540C; II,6 1548C; II,13 1561C; VII,2 1761B.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. ab. n. 408.

⁴⁶⁰ MSG 86/II, 1748D: ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις γὰρ ψυλοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐχ ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ τοῦδε τινος ἐκάστη φύσις ἐνυπόστατος ὁράται [...]. ὁ Λόγος [...] αὐτῇ τῇ ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει [...] τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν ἐνυπέστησεν.

in ...")⁴⁶¹ and in the medial ("subsist in ...") voice.⁴⁶² The term ἐνυπόστατος always signifies nothing but the reality of the two natures, which in a second step—explicitly only in the third passage—is specified by the Neochalcedonian insubistence formula. Leontius' adjective for 'insubstisting' is not ἐνυπόστατος, but συν(εν)υπόστατος. According to his reinterpretation of the traditional fire-iron-example,⁴⁶³ the iron can also correspond to the preexisting divine hypostasis receiving the fire, i.e. the insubstisting human nature: "In the hypostasis of the iron the nature of fire, which is without hypostasis in itself, is composed with the nature of the iron in becoming of common hypostasis with the former".⁴⁶⁴ This "συν" could be classified as one last stronghold of classical Chalcedonian symmetry in Leontius of Jerusalem. He not only makes the flesh insubstist in the Logos, but also both natures coexist in the one hypostasis. Thus, both the Logos and the flesh can be subject of συν(εν)υπόστατος,⁴⁶⁵ συνουσίωσις,⁴⁶⁶ συνυφίστασθαι,⁴⁶⁷ or συνυπόστασις.⁴⁶⁸

In the light of those terminological observations, especially on CN V,28, let us return to the two systematical problems of Neochalcedonian insubistence Christology we encountered in Anastasius of Antioch.⁴⁶⁹ As to the first, Christological one, we have already stated several times that for Leontius it seems to be obvious that every unique hypostasis is composed of individual substantial parts which by no means have to be ἰσάριθμοι with the hypostases constituted by them.⁴⁷⁰ Thus, Leontius clearly distinguishes between individuality and hypostatical difference, yet as far as I can see without working out the criteria for this distinction all too clearly. This becomes particularly evident from the chapters explicitly dealing with this problem, i.e. mainly CN II,6f. and II,11f.15, the Nestorian's attack on the Chalcedonian soul-body-analogy. Especially the first two chapters contain long and interesting considerations by the Nestorian which are dealt with

⁴⁶¹ Cf. apart from the previous passage I,6 1425D.

⁴⁶² Cf. II,23 1585 A; VII,6 1768dC.

⁴⁶³ Cf. Uthemann, "Definitionen und Paradigmen", 117–122.

⁴⁶⁴ CN I,49 1512B: ἐν τῇ τοῦ σιδήρου ὑποστάσει φύσις πυρὸς ἀνυπόστατος καθ' αὐτὴν οὐσα συνετέθη τῇ φύσει τοῦ σιδήρου συνυπόστατος αὐτῇ γενομένη. Pace Uthemann, "Definitionen und Paradigmen", 118f. n. 224 the text must not be altered. The ἀνυπόστατος is a clear resumption of the derived use of the word we have examined above.

⁴⁶⁵ CN V,30 1749D (Logos and flesh); V,31 1752 A (Logos).

⁴⁶⁶ IV,17 1685B (Logos and flesh).

⁴⁶⁷ II,14 1568A (Logos); V,31 1752B (Logos); VII,2 1761B (flesh). This verb was already used by Leontius of Byzantium (cf. ab. n. 198)!

⁴⁶⁸ V,23 1745B (flesh).

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. ab. nn. 413–415.

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. ab. nn. 454f.

by Leontius in a rather short and unsatisfactory manner. In CN II,6 the Nestorian asks—alluding to the distinction between three kinds of universals⁴⁷¹—what exactly is meant by the Chalcedonian “natures”: the abstract concept, the entire sum of individuals or the Platonic idea?⁴⁷² Afterwards, he adduces a long series of biblical quotations accentuating Jesus as distinct human individual, of male gender, from the seed of Abraham, born from Maria, priest and prophet like Moses and Melchisedec—features he just could not have if he were man only by nature, not also individually, i.e. hypostatically.⁴⁷³ Finally, he reports on a discussion between an apparently somewhat more sensible Chalcedonian and somebody “not inexperienced in discussion”, whether the two natures were universal (ὅλως) or individual (μερικαί):

He [i.e. the Chalcedonian] answered that they can be both the latter and the former, yet in a different respect. In that they contain in themselves the definition of the common substance, they can be called common. For the definition of the universal man is ‘rational, mortal animal’—a definition the human element in Christ obviously had as well. The same thing, he said, could be said about the divine Logos. Yet, in that neither the entire trinity became incarnate nor in every individual belonging to the human nature, they should be individual and not common. When he heard from the man who had asked him: ‘And what might individual natures be if not hypostases?’, he said: ‘That’s a Nestorian objection’. And it was sufficient for them as apology to have thus refuted their very own teaching.⁴⁷⁴

Leontius’ reply to this is rather disappointing in that it restricts itself to the arguments well known from the more general Chalcedonian discussions of the ‘no nature without hypostasis’-objection. Just like Anastasius of Antioch, he points to the fact that the concept of individual natures identical with hypostases in the divine realm unavoidably yields tritheism.⁴⁷⁵ Unlike Anastasius, he admits individual natures in the created realm, yet without identifying them with hypostases: ‘Hypostasis’, he claims, is only a necessary concomitant of individual nature, not individual nature itself, just as neither breath is identical with life nor aggravation with death nor substance with accident, although both of them are necessarily accompanied by the

⁴⁷¹ Cf. ab. nn. 290f.

⁴⁷² MSG 86/II, 1544D–1545A. The first possibility is of course excluded as the natures are not merely conceptual, the second on the grounds that only one trinitarian person became incarnate in one human being, the third because of the incorporeality of ideas.

⁴⁷³ MSG 86/II, 1545A–1548B.

⁴⁷⁴ MSG 86/II, 1548BC.

⁴⁷⁵ MSG 86/II, 1548D.1549AB. Cf. ab. n. 408.

other.⁴⁷⁶ Moreover, as the hypostasis is constituted by the sum of accidental properties, the individual substance, if identical with the former, would be constituted by accidental properties, which can hardly be adequate.⁴⁷⁷

The following objection of the Nestorian dwells again on the concept of hypostasis and emphasizes that 'hypostasis' is the only principle of distinction available for substantial realities: If individual substances can only be recognized as distinct from any other by their hypostasis, how should it be possible that two of them are hypostatically united, i.e. united exactly in their being distinct from any other?⁴⁷⁸ Leontius replies to this by referring back to what can be called the basic idea of his Christology, i.e. spelling out insubsistence in terms of idiom-composition. As he had already explained in CN I,20, the idioms constituting the three trinitarian persons are all three composed of at least two relations to the two other ones. Thus, there is no alteration involved if this composition is pluralized or enriched by also integrating the idioms of Jesus' human nature, which from his incarnation onwards actually mark off the second person from the other two persons as well.⁴⁷⁹ This at best questionable solution for the second, trinitarian problem we came across in Anastasius⁴⁸⁰ enables Leontius, however, to deal also with the first one, i.e. to reconcile the fact of the respective individual determination of Christ's two natures with the unity of his hypostasis: Christ's unique hypostasis is made up of the divine and the individually determined human nature, marked off primarily by individual physical qualities,⁴⁸¹ and the

⁴⁷⁶ MSG 86/II, 1548D–1549A. The following argument (1549BC) is of merely sophistical, if not non-sensical character: The claim that all men would have to be of the same hypostases, as all their individual substances share in their definition, is done away with by Leontius himself, e.g. in 1557B, where he concedes the obvious fact that an individual nature is constituted by more than a definition.

⁴⁷⁷ MSG 86/II, 1549C. The passage refers back to II,4 (1537BC), where the Nestorian had argued that substances cannot be part of a composite hypostasis, as hypostases are made up of accidental circumstances. The problem of how accidental circumstances are able to make up a substantial individual was also discussed by the commentators (cf. ab. nn. 331–334) and earlier on by Leontius in I,6 (1421A–C), where he makes clear that those accidents are not physical parts of the hypostasis, but only parts of its description (μερικὸι λόγοι).

⁴⁷⁸ CN II,7 (1549D–1552D). I.e.: 'hypostasis' is primarily an 'apostasis' from every other individual (1552B5).

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. CN I, 20 (1485CD); I,28 (1493CD); II,7 (1552D–1553A); II, 15 (1568AB); II,17 (1576BC); II,24 (1585CD); II,39 (1596C); IV,42 (1716CD); V,25 (1745D–1748A). In I,42 (1497D) it is affirmed that a simple eternal entity like the divine hypostasis cannot suffer reduction, but augmentation, just as a geometrical point cannot be divided, but composed with others to make a line.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. ab. nn. 414f.

⁴⁸¹ Cf. CN II,12 (1557B); II,13 (1564B).

divine and human hypostatical characteristics, which, however, fully determine the hypostasis only in their unity. This unity is described in CN II,21, where the Nestorian raises the objection that two individual substances with different hypostatical idioms can never be united in one hypostasis:

Yet, for the one who examines the matter more carefully it is obvious that all the properties of the Lord's flesh are comprised by one more universal property of it, which is also the cause of all the former ones (ἐνὶ καθολικωτέρῳ αἰτίῳ αὐτῶν πάντων ιδιώματι), namely the very fact that it did not exist godlessly (ἀθεεῖ) and never subsisted in its pure nature⁴⁸² by itself. That is why all the other properties which are displayed particularly in him in contrast to all other men are themselves godlike, like the sinless generation, his in every respect unobjectionable conduct, his generally and continuously good intention, his overpowerful force to perform miracles, his overwise knowledge, his overperfect and extraordinary virtue and such divine things. If, however, divine things never appear without divine nature, and the properties of every hypostasis have to belong particularly to itself—for nobody would count as properties of a another hypostasis what appears from or in a different one⁴⁸³—those properties of the Lord's flesh, which are in fact divine, necessarily have to give testimony to the fact that this hypostasis is not without divine nature. Yet, the divine nature, as it is not without hypostasis, additionally confirms that this hypostasis of the flesh, the godlike properties of which distinguish it from the consubstantial men, is also a divine hypostasis. If, however, the divine nature of the Logos, to which belong both the properties befitting the son before the flesh, which distinguish it from its fellow divine persons, and the godlike properties of the flesh which mark the latter off from its kindred men, has not separated itself into hypostases, the hypostasis of the Logos necessarily has to be perceived as only one, also together with the flesh, with both those natures being hypostatically united in Christ.⁴⁸⁴

Basically, this is nothing but a considerably refined version of John the Grammarian's claim that Christ's flesh had its common properties by nature, yet its individual, hypostatical ones exclusively in the divine hypostasis "being the flesh of the God Logos and nobody else's".⁴⁸⁵ Facing the Nestorian challenge, this conception obviously had to be differentiated regarding the distinction between common and individual properties. Leontius also allows for distinctive features of Christ's human nature as such, i.e. for a human ἰδική φύσις, yet, as shown by the passage just quoted, considers as

⁴⁸² Read φύσει instead of φύσιν. The dative ψιλῇ must have a reference-noun.

⁴⁸³ I.e. properties of another nature integrated from or in a different hypostasis like those of the digested food (cf. ab. n. 436) in animal bodies or the fire in the iron.

⁴⁸⁴ MSG 86/II, 1581C–1584A.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. ab. n. 150.

unique and thus constitutive for Christ's hypostasis only those properties directly caused by the presence of the divine nature. In a way, his postulate of a "unique more universal property", which is the only reason for the distinctive character of all the other (human) accidental properties, thus combines the Grammarian's inspiration with ideas we encountered in Leontius of Byzantium⁴⁸⁶ and Anastasius of Antioch:⁴⁸⁷ Just like his namesake, he maintains that a property is never constitutive for a hypostasis on its own, but only within a certain unique configuration. Just like Anastasius of Antioch, he sees the need for something like a homogeneous characterization of this set of divine and human properties. If the unity and uniqueness of this characterization is, according to Leontius, however, exclusively due to the presence of divine nature and its godlike properties which also mark off the flesh from its fellow men, the suspicion arises that the entire actual performance of Christ's life is exclusively divine,⁴⁸⁸ maybe with occasional recurrence on human potential. This is due to the conceptual disagreement between Leontius on the one hand and Anastasius I. (and later Maximus)⁴⁸⁹ on the other regarding the relationship between individual natures and hypostases. In postulating a material distinction between the latter two, i.e. having the hypostasis constituted by the addition of concrete properties to those of the human individual nature, Leontius makes the actual, individual "face" of Christ all divine. Despite the remnants of Chalcedonian symmetry in the combination of coexistence- and inexistence-terminology and his allowance for an individual human nature in Christ, Leontius is thus clearly anticipating the monergetic/monotheletic divinisation of Christ's actual biography.

⁴⁸⁶ Cf. ab. n. 413.

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. ab. n. 415.

⁴⁸⁸ Cf. Uthemann, "Definitionen und Paradigmen", 113 f.; id., "Vorbereitung", 387 f.

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. bel. nn. 548 f.

CHAPTER FOUR

ΕΝΥΤΙΟΤΑΤΟΣ, THE 'INSUBSISTENCE FORMULA', THEIR CONNECTION AND RELEVANCE FOR THE CULMINATION OF CHALCEDONIAN CHRISTOLOGICAL THOUGHT

4.1. MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

Maximus, definitely the most important Christological thinker we are dealing with in our investigation, is commonly credited with both knowing “a good deal of classical philosophy”⁴⁹⁰ and possessing “eine souveräne Kenntnis der ganzen Christologiegeschichte, insbesondere der des 6. Jahrhunderts”.⁴⁹¹ However, whether and to what extent Maximus knew any of the authors we discussed above is unclear in most of the cases. The only established fact is his acquaintance with Leontius’ of Byzantium CNE and

⁴⁹⁰ A. Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, London/New York 1996, 19. This is particularly illustrated by Sherwood’s analyses of the *Ambigua* (*The earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and his refutation of Origenism*, Rome 1955, e.g. 96–102 with regard to the concept of motion), with regard to the treatment of space and time in the commentaries on the *Categories* by P. Mueller-Jourdan, *Typologie spatio-temporelle de l’écclesia Byzantine: la Mystagogie de Maxime le confesseur dans la culture philosophique de l’antiquité tardive*, Leiden 2005 and most recently by M. Törönen, *Union and distinction in the thought of St. Maximus the Confessor*, Oxford 2007, 13–33. The earlier discussions of Maximus’ philosophical sources, e.g. W. Völker, *Maximus Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*, Wiesbaden 1965 who argues on 40–43 against v. Balthasar’s (and partly Sherwood’s) claim of a largely Aristotelian background in favour of a Neoplatonic-Dionysian one, overlook the fact that Maximus mainly represents exactly the Platonic-Aristotelian blending to be found in the commentators or even in Christian philosophical textbooks derived from them (cf. also T. Tollefsen, *The Christocentric cosmology of St. Maximus the Confessor: a study of his metaphysical principles*, Oslo 2000, 12–23).

The works of Maximus only available in MSG 90/91 (Combefis/Oehler) will be referred to using the following abbreviations: *Acta* (90,109–172), *CT* (90,1084–1173), *Cap.* XV (90,1177–1185), *Op.* (91,9–285), *Disp.* (91,288–353; the authenticity of which is, however, doubted by J. Noret, “La rédaction de la Disputation cum Pyrrho de St. Maxime le confesseur serait-elle postérieure à 655?”, in: *Analecta Bollandiana* 117 [1999], 291–296), *Ep.* (91,364–649), *Amb.* 6–71 (91,1065–1417). For the first five *Ambigua* cf. *Maximi Confessoris Ambigua ad Thomam una cum epistula secunda ad eundem*, ed. B. Janssens, Turnhout 2002 (CCG 48).

⁴⁹¹ G. Bausenhart, ‘In allem uns gleich außer der Sünde’. *Studien zum Beitrag Maximus’ des Bekenners zur altkirchlichen Christologie*, Tübingen 1990, 110.

Epilysis on which he drew very extensively,⁴⁹² as will be shown again in our analyses below. The florilegia of the Lateran synod of 649 to which Maximus made considerable contributions⁴⁹³ confuse John the Grammarian with John Khozibites, a fact which casts the same doubt on the author's knowledge of John's or Severus' work as it did in the case of Leontius' CM.⁴⁹⁴ The case of Leontius of Jerusalem is the most difficult one: Many of the authors dealing with Maximus' concept of the composite hypostasis just take Maximus' familiarity with his texts for granted, in most of the cases relying on commonplaces of Neochalcedonian Christology to be found in both authors, but of course insufficient to prove direct literary dependence.⁴⁹⁵ However, the example of Peter's and Paul's soul and body and their relationship to each other and to the composite hypostasis of both in *Ep.* 15 (552C–555A) is strongly reminiscent of the discussions in CN II,11f. and 15, just as Leontius of Jerusalem is the only extant parallel for the use of ἐτεροῦπόστατος as derived from ὁμοούσιος, not from αὐθυπόστατος.⁴⁹⁶ Yet, a

⁴⁹² Cf. F. Heinzer, *Gottes Sohn als Mensch. Die Struktur des Menschseins Christi bei Maximus Confessor*, Freiburg 1980, 90–116.

⁴⁹³ Cf. R. Riedinger, "Die Lateransynode (649) und Maximus", in: *Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2–5 Septembre 1980*, ed. F. Heinzer/C. Schönborn, Fribourg 1982, (111–121) 118f.

⁴⁹⁴ ACO ser. II vol. 1, 325, 34f. ("sanctae memoriae Johannes episcopus Caesareae Palaestinae"). Cf. ab. n. 418.

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. A. Riou, *Le monde et l'église selon Maxime le confesseur*, Paris 1973, 41: "l'influence de Léonce de Byzance sur saint Maxime a sans doute été compensée par celle de Léonce de Jerusalem, théologien nettement néochalcedonien, que saint Sophrone de Jérusalem connaissait bien, ainsi que par celle de l'auteur du *De sectis*" (C. v. Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem. Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, Paris 1972, 173 finds an influence of Leontius on Sophronius "peu probable"), or P. Piret, *Le Christ et la trinité selon Maxime le Confesseur*, Paris 1983, 169f. who claims the definition of hypostasis in *Ep.* 15 (557D: οὐσία μετὰ ἰδιωμάτων)—a commonplace of Cappadocian terminology—to be borrowed from CN I,20 (1485B: φύσεις μετὰ ἰδιωμάτων). Sherwood, *Ambigua*, 60f. suggests a possible influence of Leontius on Maximus' anthropology. L. Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator. The theological anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, Lund 1965, 41–50 just gives a list of Neochalcedonian topics and concepts resumed by Maximus and discusses his stance towards the authority of Cyril of Alexandria, but does not commit himself to the claim of any literary dependence.

⁴⁹⁶ *Op.* 13 (147C); *Op.* 14 (152A); *Ep.* 15 (549A.552B/C.553B.569A/B) cf. ab. n. 448. However, in his use of ὁμοῦπόστατος Maximus was most probably inspired by Anastasius I. of Antioch's—one of the authors discussed more frequently during the monotheletic controversy (cf. *Op.* 20 [229B–233B]; *Op.* 26 [277A–D])—work on the energies in Christ (cf. the fragment in the *Doctrina patrum*, 135,2), as Leontius used this term only in the trinitarian context (CN II,1 1534B). One could further ask whether *Op.* 16 (205A) was inspired by the 51st *aporia* in CM (1797B/C: ἰσάριθμος, trinity), or whether the γνώρισμα κοινόν of *Ep.* 15 (556C) presupposes (as N. Madden, "Composite Hypostasis in Maximus the Confessor", in: *Studia Patristica* 27 [1993], [175–197] 186–188 and Heinzer, *Gottes Sohn*, 104 seem to suppose) the concept of idiom-composition, the basic idea of Leontius' Christology (cf. ab. n. 479).

final judgement about the relationship of those two theologians will have to wait until a more detailed critical comparison of their works is available.

4.1.1. *Maximus' Usage of ἐνυπόστατος*

Reading the voluminous corpus of Maximus' extant works, one does not encounter the term ἐνυπόστατος very often. Nevertheless, there are several instances of the traditional trinitarian usage of the term in the works before 634, the *Ambigua*, the *Quaestiones et Dubia* and the *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*.⁴⁹⁷ On two occasions he comments on Gregory's of Nazianzus description of the unfolding of the divine monad via the dyad completed in the triad, the second of which (*Amb.* 23; 1260D) presents our term in entirely traditional manner, whereas the first seems to offer something new:

The monad is truly monad, as it is not principle of things after it according to the contraction of a distraction, so that it would be poured out physically in progressing to plurality, but the hypostatical essentiality of a consubstantial triad. And the triad is truly triad, as it is not completed by separable number. For it is not a composition of monads so that it could suffer separation, but a substantial subsistence of the three-hypostatic monad. For the monad is truly triad, as it is in this way, and the triad is truly monad, as it subsists in this way, as it is also one godhead, being monadically and subsisting triadically.⁴⁹⁸

Calling the holy Trinity ἐνυπόστατος ὀντότης ὁμοουσίου Τριάδος and ἐνούσιος ὑπαρξίς τρισυποστάτου μονάδος, he obviously uses two complementary formulas designed to describe the complex and vivid structure of the triad of

⁴⁹⁷ QD 136,7–12 (*Maximi confessoris quaestiones et dubia*, ed. J.H. Declerck, Turnhout 1982 [CCG 10], 97: Son and Spirit as σοφία and ζωὴ ἐνυπόστατος) / *Amb.* 7 (1077C: εἷς Λόγος ἐνούσιος καὶ ἐνυπόστατος); *Amb.* 23 (1260D: λόγος καὶ σοφία and ἀγιαστική δύναμις [spirit] as ὁμοούσια καὶ ἐνυπόστατα) / *Thal.* 48,39f. (*Maximi confessoris quaestiones ad Thalassium*, ed. C. Laga and C. Steel, vol. 1, Turnhout 1980 [CCG 7], 333: son as δύναμις ἐνυπόστατος); *Thal.* 63,52 (ed. Laga/Steel, vol. 2, Turnhout 1990 [CCG 22], 147: son as ἐνυπόστατος σοφία καὶ Λόγος); *Thal.* 64,162f. (CCG 22, 197: son as ἐνυπόστατος θεοῦ δύναμις). In such contexts, Maximus can use ὑφεστώς (*Thal.* 39,21 [CCG 7, 259] / *Expos. or. dom.* 239–242.444f. [*Maximi confessoris opuscula exegetica duo*, ed. P. van Deun, Turnhout 1991 (CCG 23), 41.53] / *Amb.* 18 [1132C]; *Amb.* 26 [1268A] / *Cap. XV* [1177B/1180A]) or αὐθυπόστατος (*Amb.* 5, 92; *Amb.* 26 [1268A]; *Op.* 1 [16D.24C] / *Disp.* [321C]) as well.

⁴⁹⁸ *Amb.* 1, 23–31: Μονάς γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἡ μονάς. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῶν μετ' αὐτὴν κατὰ διαστολῆς συστολῆν, ἵνα χεθὴ φυσικῶς εἰς πληθὺς δευόουσα, ἀλλ' ἐνυπόστατος ὀντότης ὁμοουσίου τριάδος. Καὶ τριάς ἀληθῶς ἡ τριάς, οὐκ ἀριθμῷ λυομένη συμπληρουμένη. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν μονάδων σύνθεσις, ἵνα πάθῃ διαίρεσιν, ἀλλ' ἐνούσιος ὑπαρξίς τρισυποστάτου μονάδος. Μονάς γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἡ τριάς, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστίν, καὶ τριάς ἀληθῶς ἡ μονάς, ὅτι οὕτως ὑφέστηκεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ μία θεότης, οὐσά τε μοναδικῶς, καὶ ὑφισταμένη τριαδικῶς.

hypostases in the unity of essence in a way excluding any separation of the unique divine essence or substance from the three divine hypostases: That is why the hypostatical aspect represented by ὑπαρξίς⁴⁹⁹ is qualified as ‘substantial’, the monad as ‘three-hypostatic’, the triad as ‘consubstantial’ and the substantial aspect represented by ὀντότης as ἐνυπόστατος. Thus, our term will be most correctly translated in this passage as ‘hypostatically structured’.⁵⁰⁰ This enables Maximus to apply the distinction between ὑπόστασις and ἐνυπόστατος also to trinitarian theology and to establish a univocal technical use of it in trinitarian and Christological contexts, of course without having to abandon the traditional trinitarian use completely for that purpose.

Two passages in *Myst.* and one in *Thal.* seem to resume what we have called non-technical or doxological use in our introductory passage,⁵⁰¹ i.e. the approximation of our term to ἀλήθεια-derivatives. This is particularly clear in *Myst.* 24 (ll. 938f.; CCG 69, 59), where Maximus talks about our faith to participate κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐνυποστάτως αὐτῷ τῷ πράγματι in the after-life in what we have to believe in this life. Accordingly, the ἐνυπόστατος πίστις in *Thal.* 25,³¹ is the true belief, i.e. that belief which has the real object, the true, real God, and not the fictional one of the heretics’ ἀνυπόστατος πίστις (*Acta* 132B). Thus, the difficult passage *Myst.* 20 talks about the “true and real adoption according to the gift and grace of the holy spirit”, not about the “persönlichen und als solchen wirklichen Heiligen Geist”, as Balthasar chooses to translate.⁵⁰²

Looking for instances of technical use in Christology, it is difficult to see how there can be room for ἐνυπόστατος in Maximus’ elaborated terminological system, which provides perhaps the first coherent synopsis of trinitarian and Christological teaching: The three trinitarian hypostases are ὁμοούσιοι, but ἐτερουπόστατοι, the two natures of Christ are ἐτεροοῦσιοι, but ὁμουπό-

⁴⁹⁹ This connotation of ὑπαρξίς is confirmed rather than contradicted by *Amb.* 67 (1400D–1401A), although F. Heinzer, *Gottes Sohn*, 95 n. 88 is right in emphasizing that ὑπαρξίς can also refer to the οὐσία-aspect in Maximus. A similar formula can be found in *Myst.* 23 (CCG 69, 52): μόνας οὐσίας τρισυπόστατος καὶ τριάς ὑποστάσεων ὁμοούσιος. Anastasius Sinaita, *Hodegos* XI,15–18 (CCG 8, 199) claims explicitly that ὑπαρξίς can be used both instead of οὐσία and instead of ὑπόστασις (for the justification of this claim cf. Uthemann’s extensive apparatus on those lines).

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. H.U. v. Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie. Zum Weltbild Maximus’ des Bekenners*, Einsiedeln 1961, 229: “durchhypostasiert”.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. ab. nn. 43–50.

⁵⁰² *Kosmische Liturgie*, 392. The sentence reads: Ἡ δὲ παναγία τε καὶ σεπτὴ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ μακαρίου Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἐπίκλησις τῆς δοησομένης ἐνυποστάτου τε καὶ ἐνυπάρχου κατὰ δωρεάν καὶ χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος υἰοθεσίας ἐστὶ σύμβολον (CCG 69, 47).

στατοί.⁵⁰³ The trinity is characterized by a φυσική ταυτότης (or κοινότης) and a ὑποστατική (or προσωπική) ἑτερότης (or διαφορά), the person of Christ by a ὑποστατική ταυτότης and a φυσική ἑτερότης.⁵⁰⁴ There are four passages in Maximus' works which explicitly examine the meaning of our term, two of them in a Christological context (*Op.* 16 [205A/B]; *Ep.* 15 [557D–560C]), and the other two embodied in collections of definitions clearly betraying their design for Christological purposes (*Op.* 14 [149B/C.152D]; *Op.* 23[a] [261A–264D]). The authenticity of those collections, however, is sincerely to be doubted, as Maximus was a very prominent pseudonym for Christian philosophical anthologists of this time.⁵⁰⁵ Especially *Op.* 23 seems to have been embodied into the corpus of Maximus' opuscula only because it contains a definition of 'hypostasis' by the πάνσοφος Μάξιμος (263B).

The text consists of four parts: a long excerpt from Leontius' CNE (261A–264B),⁵⁰⁶ a definition of nature and hypostasis from Clement of Alexandria and Maximus respectively (264BC), Eulogius of Alexandria's seven chapters on the two natures (264D–265C) and a final collection of definitions of 'nature' and 'hypostasis' (264C–268A). It is thus a clearly inauthentic florilegue of excerpts, which cannot belong to Maximus also for reasons of content: Firstly, considering Maximus' criticism of the Monophysites' abuse of the anthropological analogy,⁵⁰⁷ he would hardly have called the union of

⁵⁰³ Cf. *Op.* 13 (148C); *Ep.* 15 (549A.552C.553B.569A/B).

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. *Op.* 13 as a whole (interpreted by Piret, *Le Christ*, 105–155). The ὑποστατική or προσωπική ταυτότης of Christ is one of Maximus' favourite expressions: *Amb.* 3, 33; *Op.* 4 (61C); *Ep.* 13 (516C.521B); *Ep.* 15 (556B.561B.572C); *Ep.* 2 ad Thomam 2,14.20–23 (CCG 48, 42); *Myst.* 7 (CCG 69, 34). *Thal.* 28,66f. speaks of ὑποστατική διαφορά of the trinitarian persons. The most recent survey on Maximus' dogmatical terminology is provided by D. Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ: person, nature and will in the Christology of St. Maximus the Confessor*, Oxford 2004, 99–116.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. M. Roueché, "Byzantine philosophical texts of the seventh century", in: JÖB 23 (1974), 61–76.

⁵⁰⁶ 261A1f. = 1277D1f.; 261A3f. = 1277C13/D1; 261A12–B6 = 1277D3–9 (altered!); 261B10–12 = 1277D9–11; 261C4f. = 1277D12f.; 261C6–9 = 1277D11–13.1280A1; 261C10–264A2 = 1277D13–1280A1; 264A3–5 = 1277D10–13; 264A6–9.12f. = 1280A1–5; 264A14–B4 = 1280A5–8.

⁵⁰⁷ Cf. *Disp.* (336C) or *Amb.* 7 (1100A–1101C). For the antimonophysite context cf. J.-M. Garrigues, "La personne composée du Christ d'après saint Maxime le Confesseur", in: *Revue thomiste* 74 (1974), (181–204) 189–196; Madden, "Composite hypostasis", 175–182. For the difference from Leontius of Byzantium cf. Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie*, 237–239; Thunberg, *Microcosm*, 100–112 and bel. n. 517–519. The most comprehensive treatment of Maximus' stance towards the anthropological paradigm is, however, Uthemann, "Anthropologisches Paradigma", 283–312, who nevertheless fails to mention Maximus' most important predecessors. Comparing the criticism of its monophysite abuse amongst a larger number of Chalcedonian authors (not only in John of Cesarea and Leontius of Jerusalem, as Uthemann does), it turns out that its rigid rejection by the author of *De sectis* (MSG 86/I, 1249A–D)—in contrast to its qualified admission by Justinian (*Edictum rectae fidei*; ed. Amelotti, 138,18–140,14)

soul and body a “confusion”.⁵⁰⁸ Secondly, the text displays crucial differences in the interpretation of Leontius’ CNE, as it both allows for an identification of hypostasis and accident,⁵⁰⁹ especially with regard to its treatment of the colour/shape example,⁵¹⁰ and completely drops the passage 1280A12–B7, which was—as will be shown below—the most important one for Maximus.

The collection of definitions in *Op.* 14, which has also been regarded as spurious,⁵¹¹ does not show similar signs of inauthenticity. It presents a definition of our term along with a description of its property distinguishing it especially from ‘hypostasis’, which is perfectly in line with what we read especially in *Ep.* 15 (557D–560A):

ἐνυπόστατον is what is common according to the substance, i.e. the species, which truly subsists in the individuals under it and is not perceived in mere thought. Again or otherwise ἐνυπόστατον is what is composed and coexisting (συγγεϊμένον τε καὶ συνυφιστάμενον) with another substantially different entity in order to constitute a single person and to create one hypostasis and is never ever perceived by itself. (149BC)

The proprium of a hypostasis consists in being perceived by itself and being numerically distinguished from the members of the same species. The proprium of an ἐνυπόστατον either consists in being perceived in a hypostasis together with another substantially different entity in an indissoluble unity; or (it consists) in occurring in existence naturally in individuals.

(152D–153A)

ἐνυπόστατον is either what by no means subsists by itself, but is perceived in others like the species in the individuals under it, or what is composed with a substantially different entity in order to create a whole. As far as it is distinct

or Pamphilus (qu. VIII, 1–138; CCG 19, 178–183)—is most probably inspired by Theodoretus’ (or Ps-Justin’s) *Expositio fidei* 11 (ed. Otto, 36f.), which text is quoted in full by the patriarch Eutychius in a relevant context (Ananian, “L’Opusculo”, 375–377).

⁵⁰⁸ In 261A8–11 it says: “ἐνυπόστατον signifies the very fact that something is in a hypostasis and does not subsist in itself or by itself, i.e. that which does not come together in one entity from incomplete parts, but which is perceived in the union of a complete and an incomplete part in the way of a confusion”. Dell’Osso, “Concept”, 70–74 takes this text as a starting-point in his also otherwise quite unfruitful treatment of our term in Maximus.

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. *Op.* 16 (205A/B): ἐνυπόστατον, ἵνα μὴ ὡς συμβεβηκὸς ἐπινόη μόνη λαμβάνηται. In *Op.* 14 and *Ep.* 15, the accident is not mentioned in the relevant context, but the example of the species (149C; 560A) makes clear that Maximus does not intend an identification of ἐνυπόστατον and accident.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. 261B11–13 (he knows about the philosophical axiom!); 261C10–264A2; 264A11–13. Maximus reflects this example only in *Op.* 16 (204A–D), immediately before assuring that ἐνυπόστατον is by no means an accident (cf. last note). For his approval of the philosophical axiom behind it cf. *Ep.* 6 (425C).

⁵¹¹ Cf. Uthemann, “Anthropologisches Paradigma”, 301f., n. 90.

due to the properties marking it off from its substantial cognates, it is united and identified with what it is hypostatically composed (συγκείμενον) with. For by the properties which mark it off from its cognates it is not distinguished τοῦ συγκειμένου καθ' ἑνώσιν καὶ συνυφαστώτος. (557D–560A)

Just as in Ephrem,⁵¹² we encounter two kinds of ἐνυπόστατον, a 'Christological' one and a 'usual' one. Yet, in contrast to Ephrem, the usual one is no longer just the 'hypostatically real' entity, but the species subsisting *in* the individuals under it. Hence, Maximus' definitions are even less concerned with the traditional, generally accepted usage of the term, but strictly concentrated on its technical application primarily in Christology. He derives his two kinds of ἐνυπόστατα not from Ephrem or a similar text pertaining to the 'twofold-use'-tradition, but most probably directly from the two alternative definitions of 'hypostasis' mentioned in Leontius of Byzantium, CNE 1280A.⁵¹³ Where Leontius is just adding a second definition of 'hypostasis' designed for Christological usage, Maximus finds him distinguishing two different kinds of hypostasis, a simple natural and a composite supernatural one: Either a species realizes itself naturally in its individuals, or it realizes itself together with another species in a composite hypostasis, which is not the result of physical species-procreation. This distinction reflects Maximus' central antimonophysite insight concerning the difference between the natural composite hypostasis of man (which is 'simple' with respect to genus-species-logic) and the non-natural one of Christ himself,⁵¹⁴ which is most adequately described for Maximus by the Leontian phrase "what consists of different natures and possesses a common existence simultaneously and in each other [...], on the grounds that neither of the two natures or substances is perceived by itself, but (only) accompanied by the other it is composed and grown together with (μετὰ τῆς συγκειμένης καὶ συμπεφυκυίας)." (1280A/B)

⁵¹² Cf. ab. n. 340. However, in *Ep.* 15 (557D), he calls also the ἰδίωμα ἐνυπόστατον: "The true and hypostatical unity [...] displays the property separating both parts from the substantial community by associating it with the common element as ἐνυπόστατον, not as hypostasis, as it never subsisted separately by itself, marked off from the members of its species or from the element coexisting with it according to the union in order to create a whole". Yet, ἰδίωμα stands here for Christ's ἰδικαὶ φύσεις, his divine and his human individuality, which are said to have never distinguished him on their own from other human individuals or divine hypostases, but to have always constituted simultaneously both his hypostatical identity with himself and difference from the others.

⁵¹³ Quoted ab. at n. 182.

⁵¹⁴ Cf. e.g. *Ep.* 12 (488A–492C) and the references ab. n. 507.

Apparently, this is Maximus' key phrase not only for describing the composite hypostasis of Christ, but also for understanding what is meant by ἐνυπόστατον in Leontius. It recurs several times in Maximus' works, often varied by replacing συμφύειν with συνυφίστασθαι,⁵¹⁵ although Maximus is quite fond of using the corresponding noun συμφυία in the Christological context.⁵¹⁶ Nevertheless, there is a crucial difference between Maximus and Leontius: Whereas Leontius' Platonic anthropology enables him to present the composite hypostasis of man as an outstanding example for the second, Christological case, man exclusively belongs to the first category for Maximus, the second one being strictly reserved for the μονώτατος incarnate Logos.⁵¹⁷ Leontius' Platonism ignores the physical constitution of a human being and describes the embodiment of soul as a quasi-incarnation accomplished by a special act of divine power⁵¹⁸ and can thus push the parallel between man and Christ pretty far. As a consequence, the relation between man's metaphysical membership of a class and his physical composition of two substantially different elements (in Balthasar's terms: his metaphysical and physical composition) is reduced to the unexplained brutum factum that there are several soul-body composites forming a class, while there is only one divine-human composite without class. By differentiating between natural and non-natural composite hypostases Maximus overcame this problem and thus most severely challenged the monophysite 'abuse' of the anthropological paradigm.⁵¹⁹

How, then, does the term ἐνυπόστατος fit into the terminological framework mentioned in the beginning? A comparison of the passages from *Ep.* 15 and *Amb.* 1, 20–31 might provide the answer. In trinitarian theology, it

⁵¹⁵ Cf. e.g. *Amb.* 5, 283 f. (μήτε [...] τῆς συγκειμένης καὶ συνυφεστῶσης [scil. φυσικῆς ἐνεργείας] διακεκριμένην); *Ep.* 12 (501C: μετὰ τῆς συγκειμένης καὶ συμπεφυκυίας); *Ep.* 19 (593B/C: μήτε [...] τῆς τοῦ συγκειμένου καὶ συνυφεστῶτος [scil. δυνάμεως] κειχωρισμένην).

⁵¹⁶ Cf. e.g. *Op.* 2 (48B); *Op.* 6 (65B.68C); *Op.* 7 (81D.88A); *Op.* 8 (100C.101A.108C); *Op.* 9 (117B); *Op.* 16 (197A); *Op.* 20 (236A). The term is traditionally employed (by Maximus' icon Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa and Leontius of Byzantium!) both in the trinitarian (Cf. Maximus, *Cap.* XV [1177A]; Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. [1292a] B1) and Christological contexts (Lampe, *ibid.* [1292a/b] B2).

⁵¹⁷ *Ep.* 13 (532B/C): "The supernatural is not measured by nature nor is any existing reality by nature capable of that at all. Thus the most unique Logos in assuming a rationally and intellectually ensouled flesh willingly became man in an ineffable manner, as being and preexisting and able to do anything, having renewed the natures in the supernatural way in order to save mankind".

⁵¹⁸ *Epiphysis* 1940B: "I am that far from claiming on the level of nature that the God-Logos has a unity with our nature that I would not even tolerate speaking of the human soul as suffering the conjunction with its body physically without the divine power".

⁵¹⁹ Cf. the references *ab. n.* 507.

is as important to maintain that a hypostasis ἐνούσιος is not necessarily an οὐσία of its own, as it is in Christology to prove that a φύσις ἐνυπόστατος is not necessarily a hypostasis of its own.⁵²⁰ Hence, ἐνυπόστατος and ἐνούσιος describe the relationship of nature and hypostasis a parte naturae and a parte subsistentiae. The substantiality of a hypostasis can either be unique (in the case of ‘natural hypostases’) or twofold (in the case of Christ), whereas the hypostatical realization of a nature can either be uniform (in case of the natural procreation of species-individuals) or in the form of a hypostatical coexistence with another nature (in case of Christ). How this relationship has to be specified in metaphysical categories has been profoundly discussed among Maximus-scholars since V. Lossky’s objection against Balthasar’s application of the essence-existence-distinction to Maximus’ nature-hypostasis-concept.⁵²¹ Riou, Garrigues and Piret all side with Lossky in claiming that οὐσία never means pure essence as actually distinguished from existence in Maximus.⁵²² As Balthasar envisages the actual distinction between essence and existence only as a possible consequence of Maximus’ system and stresses the vivid interdependence and inseparability of both otherwise,⁵²³ their criticism is at least partly unjustified. Nevertheless, when Balthasar—relying mainly on Junglas—interprets ἐνυπόστατος as “mittleren Existenzgrad zwischen Nichtsein (oder akzidentellem Sein) und voller hypostatischer Existenz” or “mittlerer Seinstufe zwischen Natursein und hypostatischem Sein”,⁵²⁴ he should have clarified more emphatically that this refers at best to the tradition before Maximus, not to the Confessor himself. For Maximus, Piret is certainly right in maintaining that the ἐνυπόστατον “n’est pas un intermédiaire réel entre l’hypostase et son ousie. Elle [l’enhypostasie] n’ajoute rien au rapport strict de l’ousie et de l’hypostase, et ne fait pas nombre avec lui; elle vise au contraire à circonscrire l’être et le subsister dans ce rapport lui-même”.⁵²⁵

The third text from *Op.* 16 (205A/B) transfers our term explicitly into the context of the monotheletic discussion.⁵²⁶ Here Maximus reacts to a

⁵²⁰ Cf. *Op.* 16 (205A), on which text bel. nn. 529–534.

⁵²¹ Cf. Madden, “Composite hypostasis”, 190.

⁵²² Riou, *L’Église*, 79 n. 1; Garrigues, “Personne composée”, 191 n. 51 and 197–200; Piret, *Le Christ*, 30–37 and 200f.

⁵²³ *Kosmische Liturgie*, 223–224.245f.

⁵²⁴ *Ibid.*, 228.237. Cf. Helmer, *Neuchalkedonismus*, 230: “Zwischenbegriff zwischen Hypostase und Natur” (with regard to Pamphilus).

⁵²⁵ *Le Christ*, 172 cf. 185.

⁵²⁶ On the monothelite theologians cf. the useful survey of Bathrellos, *Byzantine Christ*, 69–98.

monergetic transformation of the ‘no nature without hypostasis’ objection in a way which clearly reflects his intense study of Leontius of Byzantium:

If they perhaps infer against those who confess the natural and human energy of the Lord on the grounds that he is not without energy (οὐκ ἀνεέργητος) according to his flesh, that in this case the latter would neither be without hypostasis (οὐκ ἀνυπόστατος), this is an abuse of ‘hypostasis’. For the fact that the nature is not without a hypostasis does not make a hypostasis of it, just as the fact, that there is no body without shape (ἀσχημάτιστος), does not make something a shape once it is a body. Neither does the fact that something generated is not ungenerated or something visible⁵²⁷ is not invisible make of the respective entity generation or sight. Nor does it in any case, if something is denied to be that which it at any rate is not, make a relationship (σχέσις) of the positive correspondent, in which this relationship is naturally perceived.⁵²⁸

As *Op.* 23 (261C–264A) is spurious, this is the only passage where Maximus is explicitly referring to this famous objection, whereas his genuinely anti-monophysite treatises are concerned with other topics like the separating force of the number two or the impossibility of two permanently distinct natural qualities without their proper subjects, the two natures.⁵²⁹ Here it is the Monothelites whom he has to remind that making a hypostasis of the φύσις οὐκ ἀνεέργητος and therefore neither ἀνυπόστατος or an οὐσία of the ὑπόστασις οὐκ ἀνούσιος would separate the trinity into three substances and would force the two natures of Christ together into one (205A). For, as the tradition of the holy fathers teaches,

the ‘not ἀνυπόστατον’ does not make a hypostasis of the nature, but an ἐνυπόστατον, so that it is not perceived in mere thought like an accident, but in actual fact like a species. Accordingly, the ‘not ἀνούσιον’ does not make an οὐσία of the hypostasis, but represents it as an ἐνούσιον, so that we conceive of it not as pure property, but really together with the subject of this property. Just as here the ἐνυπόστατον means the ἐνύπαρκτον, and ἐνύπαρκτον is what participates in substantial and natural ὑπαρξίς, the ἐνεργόν or ἐνεργητικόν there signifies properly the ἐνδύναμον, and ἐνδύναμον is what has a substantial and natural δύναμις. Confessing the natures in Christ not to be without hypostasis or energy therefore does not amount to introducing hypostases or active subjects (ἐνεργούντας), but to admitting his natural ontological aspects (ὑπάρξεις) and energies in an orthodox way. (205A/B)

⁵²⁷ The parallel construction of those sentences requires τὸ γεννητὸν ἢ ὁρατὸν to be made the logical subject of the Acl rather than the object of ποιεῖ.

⁵²⁸ *Op.* 16 (204AB). Following Gregory of Nazianzus’s trinitarian terminology, Maximus labels any kind of intentional action like γέννησις, θέλησις or ὁρασις as σχέσις, i.e. “relationship” between a subject and an object (cf. *ibid.* 188BC!).

⁵²⁹ The texts are gathered by Garrigues, “Personne composée”, 191 n. 54. For the natural qualities in Severus cf. Lebon, “Christologie”, 536–542.

Whereas the first part of this quotation perfectly confirms what we have said about Maximus' integration of our term into his terminological system above, the second part seems to offer something new. Why does Maximus resume the substitution of ἐνύπαρκτον for ἐνυπόστατον we already encountered in Ps-Basil and Ephrem of Amid?⁵³⁰ Obviously, because this is perfectly in line with defending his dyotheletic conception on the basis of the definition of 'natural will' given at the beginning of the treatise. If natural will has to be distinguished from arbitrary will in that it is "the appetitive power of a natural being conserving all the properties which substantially belong to this nature",⁵³¹ it can be easily shown that no (appetitive) nature can actually realize itself without it. This is what he does most emphatically at the beginning of the second half of the treatise, when he turns from the alleged unity of will to the unity of energy.⁵³² If a composite hypostasis does not have different natural powers to realize, what is it supposed to do? How should there be ascribed any kind of reality (ὑπαρξις) to its different ontological or natural aspects, if they do not have the power to manifest themselves? A nature, as he expounds further, only realizes itself in its distinction from any other nature by its constitutive specific difference, its natural motion, power or energy which marks it off from every other nature of the same genus.⁵³³ without appetitive rational motion, power or energy there can be no human reality (ὑπαρξις) in Christ. If the ἐνέργεια of Christ's human nature is conceived in this way, as natural motion or power, it can no longer be confused with a human ἐνεργῶν, i.e. a second human hypostasis in Christ. However, this lack of individual independence does not by any means deprive it of its reality, its ὑπαρξις all together, as this vague ὑπαρξις⁵³⁴ is additionally qualified as ἐνυπόστατος, i.e. a species or substance realized in a substantial hypostasis.

⁵³⁰ Cf. ab. n. 343 and also Maximus himself, *Myst.* 20 (ab. n. 502).

⁵³¹ *Op.* 16 (185D). On the distinction between natural and arbitrary (gnomic) will in Maximus in general cf. Thunberg, *Microcosm*, 220–239.

⁵³² Cf. esp. *Op.* 16 (197C–201C).

⁵³³ Cf. esp. 200B and 201AB.

⁵³⁴ The use of ὑπαρξις in this most general sense in a way echoes the twofold-use-tradition (cf. ab. nn. 395f.). Cf. also Anastasius Sinaita bel. after n. 587 and the *Doctrina patrum*, 39,19–24 (on the difference of οὐσία and φύσις according to pagan philosophers): Τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ὄνομα σημαντικὸν ὑπάρχει τῆς ἀπλῶς τῶν ὄντων ὑπάρξεως τουτέστιν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπλῶς εἶναι τῶν ὄντων. εἶναι γὰρ λέγονται καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος καὶ ὁ λίθος καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα. τούτου οὖν τοῦ ἀπλῶς εἶναι, οὐ κοινῶς πάντα μετέχουσι, σημαντικὸν ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ὄνομα. (resumed on p. 40,2 f.).

4.1.2. *The Insubsistence Formula in Maximus*

As to Maximus' use of the insubsistence formula, it is first of all worthwhile to note its occurrence in several non-christological contexts: It describes, of course, the relationship of accidents to their subject,⁵³⁵ that of parts to their whole,⁵³⁶ that of the soul to the body,⁵³⁷ and also that of universal natures to their particular instances.⁵³⁸ With regard to its use in the Christological context, Thunberg's statement that Maximus "combines his acceptance of Neo-Chalcedonian formulations and positions [...] with a more strict Chalcedonian dialectic"⁵³⁹ holds absolutely true. Maximus claims the flesh to be "in" the Logos several times using different wordings: The assumed nature "does not appear as self-subsisting, i.e. by itself, but receives its being in the God-Logos, who truly gives substance to it, itself",⁵⁴⁰ it "comes to be in the Logos according to one and the same hypostasis [...] getting allotted in him the physical being simultaneously with the divine subsistence",⁵⁴¹ it "is perfectly [...] in the Logos",⁵⁴² it "comes to be in the Logos and the wisdom itself indissolubly in a unity",⁵⁴³ "did not preexist for the blink of an eye, but received its being and subsisting in the God and Logos himself",⁵⁴⁴ "received in him nature and hypostasis, i.e. being and subsisting" or "received in him and through him the origin of its being".⁵⁴⁵ He even

⁵³⁵ Cf. e.g. *Amb.* 67 (1400C); *CT* II,3 (1125D); *Op.* 1 (25D); *Ep.* 12 (473D–476D.485B/C). However, ὑφίστασθαι ἐν is also used for divine attributes which cannot count as accidents (cf. *Op.* 21 [249A]); *Thal.* 55,158 (CCG 7, 489); *OrDom* 192f. (CCG 23, 37). *Amb.* 22 (1256D–1257C) even describes the universal inexistence of God, of the One in the many, in an almost Proclan manner.

⁵³⁶ Cf. e.g. *Amb.* 10,32 (1169C).

⁵³⁷ *Ep.* 7 (436D–437B); *Amb.* 42 (1337A) cf. *ibid.* 1324A (not καθ' αὐτό).

⁵³⁸ Cf. e.g. *Amb.* 10,42 (1189C–1192A); *Amb.* 41 (1312A–D); *Ep.* 13 (517D).

⁵³⁹ *Microcosm*, 50.

⁵⁴⁰ *Amb.* 5, 112–114 (οὐκ αὐθυπόστατον φανείσαν [scil. the assumed nature], τουτέστι καθ' ἐαυτήν, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καθ' ἀλήθειαν αὐτὴν οὐσιωθέντι Θεῷ Λόγῳ τὸ εἶναι λαβοῦσαν).

⁵⁴¹ *Op.* 4 (61B): ἐν ἐκείνῳ [scil. Λόγῳ] κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν γεγονός [...] ἅμα τῷ εἶναι φυσικῶς καὶ τὸ ὑποστῆναι θεικῶς ἐν αὐτῷ κληρωσάμενον. The frequent connection of τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ ὑποστῆναι is probably inspired by Theodore of Raithu's *Praeparatio* (ed. Diekamp, 192,19f.: ἐν τῷ προσλαβομένῳ αὐτὴν θεῷ λόγῳ τὸ εἶναι τε καὶ ὑποστῆναι λαχοῦσα; quoted in full ab. n. 370).

⁵⁴² *Op.* 7 (76B): ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ [...] οὕτως τελείως.

⁵⁴³ *Op.* 8 (93B): γενόμενον ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Λόγῳ καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ καθ' ἑνωσιν ἀδιασπάστως.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ep.* 12 (468A/B): οὐδ' ὥς ἐν ῥίπῃ ὀφθαλμοῦ προὑποστάσαν, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Λόγῳ καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ ὑποστῆναι λαβοῦσαν.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ep.* 15 (553D: ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν φύσιν λαβοῦσης καὶ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, τουτέστι τὸ εἶναι τε καὶ τὸ ὑφεστάναι; 560C: ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δι' αὐτὸν λαβοῦσα τοῦ εἶναι τὴν γένεσιν). Cf. also *Op.* 24 (269C): ἡ ζωοποιός σὰρξ [...] ἐν αὐτῷ ἔσχε τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ πάντα τὰ ὑπερφυὰ τῆς ἰδίας φύσεως.

quotes the letter to Jovianus once as Athanasius⁵⁴⁶ and alludes to it in other places.⁵⁴⁷ However, since a quasi-accidental relationship of the human nature to the Logos as a divine super-subject is rather alien to Maximus' Christological concept, he favoured—perhaps inspired by Anastasius I. of Antioch⁵⁴⁸—a more immediate connection of natures and hypostasis expressed either by the copula or by a genitive: Christ is the hypostasis of his natures, he is “nothing else but his natures”.⁵⁴⁹ Nevertheless, his peculiar phrasing of the insubistence formula deserves a closer look: His favourite verb seems to be λαμβάνειν ἐν. However, what the flesh “takes” or “receives” in the Logos is not only hypostasis, subsistence, but also τὸ εἶναι, which is explained in *Ep.* 15 (553D) as τὴν φύσιν. Maximus' theory of Christ's composite hypostasis is not restricted to providing an explanation of how Jesus' humanity can subsist if it is not an independent hypostasis, but also comprises an account of its coming to be, as for Maximus only this account can also solve the subsistence problem properly. According to Maximus, the Logos replaced the male seed,⁵⁵⁰ which according to Aristotelian biology

⁵⁴⁶ *Op.* 16 (197B): The “rational, ensouled flesh” implies the existence of a human will from the beginning. On this letter and its importance for our topic cf. ab. nn. 164–171.

⁵⁴⁷ Cf. e.g. *Ep.* 15 (552D: ἄμα—ἄμα—ἄμα).

⁵⁴⁸ Cf. *Logos* 3,19 f. (ed. Sakkos 51,31–52,7): “Christ is the combination of those [scil. natures], not their relationship, but immediately the coming-together (συνπλοκή) of those substances, rather (he is) the substances themselves, neither the divine without the human nor again the human separated from the divine, but the inseparable mixture and intermingling of both. Of the latter we do not speak analogously to those liquids, which are naturally apt to be transformed into something else in the intermingling with one another, but according to the aforesaid analogy of soul and body, from which man is completed as a rational animal, from the intelligible and sensible element simultaneously intelligible and sensible. This way one should perceive the mystery—obviously in a blurred manner—also here. For both came together simultaneously, the divine and the human, and the product of the composition manifests nothing but what was the nature of each of the two combined elements”.

⁵⁴⁹ *Disp.* (289B); cf. Heinzer, *Gottes Sohn*, 90f.; Piret, “Christologie et théologie trinitaire chez Maxime le Confesseur d'après sa formule des natures ‘desquelles, en lesquelles et lesquelles et le Christ’”, in: Heinzer/Schönborn, *Symposium*, 215–222 (more extensive in *Le Christ*, 203–240). According to Bausenhardt, *Sünde*, 170 n. 3, Piret has missed ep. 19 (593A/B) and op. 3a (edited by Epifanovič). The genitive can be found in the following passages: *Amb.* 4, 74–81; *Amb.* 5, 127–133; *Op.* 1 (36B); *Op.* 8 (95B); *Disp.* 296D; *Ep.* 2 ad Thomam 2,82 f. (CCG 48, 45). Ibid. 2,26–29, Maximus says that the flesh has the Logos as a hypostasis (αὐτὸν [...] ἐσχεν ὑπόστασιν).

⁵⁵⁰ Cf. *Amb.* 2, 6–9; *Amb.* 5, 66–72.139–149; *Op.* 4 (60A.61B); *Ep.* 14 (537 A); *Ep.* 15 (553D); *Ep.* 19 (592C/D); *Ep.* ad Thom 2, 25. Maximus uses the phrases σποράς δικήν, ἀντὶ σποράς, ἐν εἶδει σποράς or σπορά γίνεσθαι, but—as far as I can see—never Theodoretus' οἷον ἐθεὶς σπόρος (cf. ab. n. 372). Did he develop the idea independently from this source? As the Theodoretus-passages was contained in one of the florilegia of Leontius' of Byzantium CNE (cf. Declerck's apparatus on *Panhoplion* III,31–33; CCG 19, 145), Maximus should have been

exerts the forming power upon the female menstrual blood, the material element of this process:

[I]n fact the male provides both the form and the source of movement while the female provides the body, i.e. the matter. Just as in the setting (πήξις) of milk, while the body is the milk, the curdling-juice or rennet is the container of the source that constitutes it, so is that which comes from the male when it is partitioned in the female.⁵⁵¹

The comparison of the formation of an embryo with the curdling of milk already occurs in Job 10:10⁵⁵² and again—in a fashion definitely influenced by Aristotelian philosophy—in Sap 7:1f.: “In the womb of a mother I was molded into flesh, within the period of ten months curdled (παγείς) in blood by the seed of a man during the pleasure of marriage”. As this biblical authorization made Aristotle’s theory very widespread among Christian authors,⁵⁵³ a very tempting suggestion would be to connect the Christological use of the verb (συμ-) πήγνυσθαι to be found in Maximus and other authors⁵⁵⁴ with the curdling-analogy and translate it as ‘to be curdled’ or ‘condensed’. However, a more detailed examination of the relevant context—especially if one takes into account the parallels in John of Damascus—seems to reveal a different analogy behind the verb: συμπήγνυσθαι is understood rather mechanically in the sense of composing parts—in

at least superficially acquainted with it. Yet, it should be noted that already the small Apollinarian sermon *Quod unus sit Christus* 11 (Lietzmann, Apollinaris, 301f.) presents a similar appeal the Aristotelian concept of propagation in order to substantiate the denial of Christ’s descendance from Adam.

⁵⁵¹ Aristotle, *De generatione animalium* I,20 729a9–14. The translation is taken from *De partibus animalium* I and *De Generatione animalium* I (with passages from II,1–3), translated with notes by D.M. Balme, Oxford ²1992, 51. For Aristotle’s further development and foundation of his theory cf. 726b1–24.728b32–729a33.730a24–b32 (pp. 45f.51–55 in Balme’s translation). For a survey of the ancient conceptions of generation and embryology cf. H. Balss, “Die Zeugungslehre und Embryologie in der Antike. Eine Übersicht”, in: *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin* 5 (1936), (1–82) 10–14.35–40.42–45. For a more detailed account of Aristotle’s theory cf. E. Lesky, *Die Zeugungs- und Vererbungslehren der Antike und ihr Nachwirken*, Wiesbaden 1950, 1349–1351.1358–1365. The milk-analogy and the verb (συμ-)πήγνυσθαι is treated *ibid.*, 1308f. (*Corpus Hippocraticum*).1361f. (Aristotle).

⁵⁵² Also the manuscript-tradition of this passage offers ἐπηξας as a varia lectio to ἐτέρωσας. A fragment of Chrysostomus’ exegesis explains the τυροῦν by συμπήγνυσθαι (MSG 64, 608A).

⁵⁵³ Cf. J.H. Waszink, Art. “Embryologie A II. Jüdisch/B. Christlich”, in: RAC IV (1959), col. 1241–1244. Accordingly, at least since Denys, *De divinis nominibus* II,9; PTS 33, 133.5–12 (cf. Lampe, s.v. αἶμα [50a] I F) the παρθενικὰ αἶμαα are considered as the matter in the process of Christ’s generation (cf. Maximus, *Op.* 4 [60A]; *Amb.* 5, 70–72; cf. also *Amb.* 42 [1321B]). For the further development of this Logos-seed-theory cf. bel. nn. 662–667 on John of Damascus.

⁵⁵⁴ Cf. *Amb.* 7 (1097B); *Amb.* 61 (1385D) and bel. nn. 658f.

this case: body-parts or organs—into a stable unity.⁵⁵⁵ In this sense the verb can already be found in the Christological discussions of the late fourth century in descriptions of the formation of the man Jesus in the womb of Mary.⁵⁵⁶ In Maximus, there are some signs of an ecclesiological extension of this notion: The Logos not only ‘composes’ or ‘compacts’ the parts of his human nature, soul and body, but via this assumption he also ‘composes’ the human individuals forming the body of the Holy Church.⁵⁵⁷ However, the aspect of central relevance for Maximus’ Christology is another one: This new way of birth is decisive for Christ’s τρόπος ὑπάρξεως, i.e. for his new way of being human,⁵⁵⁸ as being begotten by human seed indicates the human τρόπος as subject to sin and thus to death: σπορά entails φθορά.⁵⁵⁹ This new τρόπος, not a quasi-accidental inherence of his human nature, integrates both of Christ’s natures without doing any harm to their substantial λόγος and thus constitutes the unity of his hypostasis. The immediate coincidence between the coming to be of the man Jesus and the incarnation

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. Galen’s expression πρώτη συμπήξις for the original ‘putting-together’ or constitution of an animal (e.g. *De usu partium* 14,7; ed. G. Helmreich, vol. 2, Leipzig 1909, 307,24 f. [Kühn IV, 172 f.]); opposition of the universal genus of an animal and τοῦδε τοῦ ζώου τοῦ ἀτόμου συμπήξις / *De causis morborum*; ed. C.G. Kühn, vol. 7, Leipzig 1824 [repr. Hildesheim 1965], 25 / *De marcore*, ed. Kühn, vol. 7, 678). Philoponus explains a premature dissolution of this συμπήξις of an animal relating it to its basic principles, the male and female seed in his commentary on *De gen. et corr.* 336b20 (CAG XIV/2, 295,8–296,10).

⁵⁵⁶ Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina dogmatica* 10 (MSG 37, 464D–465A) / Ps-Athanasius, *De sancta trinitate dialogi* IV, 3 (ed. A. Capone, 72) / Ps-Athanasius, *Dialogi contra Macedonianos* II, 133–135 (ed. E. Cavalcanti, 120). In Nemesius, *De natura hominis* 25; ed. M. Morani, Leipzig 1987, 87,5–7 the verb is used to describe the formation of the skin layers around the embryo, the Chorion and the Allantois, as curdling around the teats in the womb (cf. Balss, “Zeugungslehre”, 45 f.). In the sixth century, it appears in the relevant context, e.g. in Anastasius I. of Antioch’s sermon on the incarnation (*Logos* 3,12; ed. Sakkos 50,13–15: the Logos “put together” for himself an instrument in order to become visible and to exert the deeds of salvation). The earliest Christian reference I could find is Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 1,6,38,3; ed. O. Stählin, Leipzig 1905 (GCS 12), 113: δι’ ὧν ἡ ἐκκλησία, καθάπερ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ πολλῶν συνεστηκυῖα μελῶν, ἄρδεταί τε καὶ αὔξεται συγκροτεῖται τε καὶ συμπήγνυται ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, σώματος μὲν τῆς πίστεως, ψυχῆς δὲ τῆς ἐλπίδος, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐκ σαρκὸς καὶ αἱματος.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. *Amb.* 7 (1097B): ἡμᾶς διὰ τῆς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἁγίας αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς ὥσπερ δι’ ἀπαρχῆς ἐαυτῷ συμπηξαμένου / *Amb.* 61 (1385D): τὴν ἀνθρώπινην φύσιν ἐν ἐαυτῷ πηξάμενος ἐνώσει τῇ κατ’ ὑπόστασιν / *Ep.* 12 (504B): αὐτὴν (scil. ἐκκλησίαν) συμπηξαμένου τε καὶ ἀρμοσαμένου τοῦ Χριστοῦ. On the close relationship between Christology and ecclesiology in Maximus cf. also my “Vermischt, ausgetauscht und kreuzweis zugesprochen”, 91–93.

⁵⁵⁸ On the distinction between λόγος φύσεως and τρόπος ὑπάρξεως in Maximus cf. Riou, *L’Église*, 73–88; Heinzer, *Gottes Sohn*, 29–58, 117–145. On Maximus Logos-conception in general cf. A.E. Kattan, *Verleiblichung und Synergie. Grundzüge der Bibelhermeneutik bei Maximus Confessor*, Leiden/Boston 2003, 38–79.

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. e.g. *Amb.* 31 (1276A); *Amb.* 41 (1313C/D); *Amb.* 42 (1317C.1341C); QD 113,19 f. (CCG 10, 84).

of the divine Logos, i.e. the exclusion of a human seed and a προδιάπλασις of this man, constitutes a hypostasis which because of its direct divine origin is “complètement filialisée”.⁵⁶⁰ Its human existence is elevated onto a new level characterized by the novelty of divine subsistence (ὑποστήναι θεϊκῶς).⁵⁶¹ Thus, Maximus solves the two aforesaid systematical problems of the Neochalcedonian insubistence Christology on similar lines as Anastasius I. of Antioch,⁵⁶² yet in a clearly more refined way: In reinterpreting the “property of sonship” as a mode of existence, the identity between Christ qua second trinitarian hypostasis and qua hypostasis of the two natures becomes much more plausible, as it is not so much a second generation, clearly different from the first, which marks off Christ’s hypostasis, but the formally divine actualisation of the human natural properties—the very same way of actualisation which also applies to the divine ones. As this τρόπος ὑπάρξεως, however, according to the Cappadocian identification of ‘mode of existence’ and ‘mode of origin’, not only actualizes, but also creates the human element, there can also be no question of a separate human hypostasis marked off from the Logos by individual human properties. In developing Leontius’ of Byzantium solution to the problem further,⁵⁶³ Maximus makes it absolutely clear that individuality cannot be constituted by one or several individual accidents (which in any case would only mark off members of the same species against each other),⁵⁶⁴ but only by a biographical process in its entirety constituted—according to Cappadocian premises—primarily by its origin.

How is this insubistence concept related to Maximus’ use of ἐνυπόστατος? In explaining ἐνυπόστατος, he speaks of insubistence only with respect to the case of natural hypostatical realisation,⁵⁶⁵ whereas the Christological case is specified as co-subsistence. However, in *Ep.* 15 (560B/C) he maintains that Christ’s human nature is by no means an independent hypostasis, is not perceived by itself for a single moment, but is ἐνυπόστατος “as receiving the origin of its being in him and through him” (ὥς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ

⁵⁶⁰ Garrigues, “Personne composée”, 202.

⁵⁶¹ Maximus never explicitly identifies the trinitarian and the human τρόπος ὑπάρξεως of the Logos, as γεννητός is definitely not the same as ἀσπορος. However, both predicates coincide with respect to the immediate and direct divine origin. On this problem cf. Heinzer, *Gottes Sohn*, 137–145 and bel. nn. 670f. on John of Damascus.

⁵⁶² Cf. ab. n. 415.

⁵⁶³ Cf. ab. n. 413.

⁵⁶⁴ Cf. ab. n. 514.

⁵⁶⁵ *Op.* 14 (149A: τὸ ἐν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀτόμοις πραγματικῶς ὑφιστάμενον; 153A: τὸ ἐν ἀτόμοις φυσικῶς τυγχάνειν καθ’ ὑπαρξιν); *Ep.* 15 (557D–560A: τὸ καθ’ αὐτὸ μὲν οὐδαμῶς ὑφιστάμενον, ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ θεωρούμενον, ὥς εἶδος ἐν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸ ἀτόμοις).

δι' αὐτὸν λαβοῦσα τοῦ εἶναι τὴν γένεσιν). Even more clearly than in Leontius of Jerusalem, the reason for and mode of (ὡς) the hypostatical realization of Christ's human nature (its being ἐνυπόστατος) is described here by the insubsistence formula—of course in its Maximian transformation. The rapport between nature and hypostasis (or λόγος φύσεως and τρόπος ὑπάρξεως) referred to by the term ἐνυπόστατος can thus be described correctly as insubsistence, not only in case of the natural, but also in case of the Christological realization of the human nature, provided that any connotation of (quasi-) accidental inherence or asymmetry is ruled out. This is the reason, why Maximus (inspired mainly by Leontius of Byzantium, but possibly also by his namesake from Jerusalem) prefers co-subsistence-formulas with regard to the Christological case and, in the end, formalizes the pseudo-Athanasian insubsistence formula to such a degree that it appears compatible to the Chalcedonian symmetry. As the 'no nature without hypostasis' objection seems to be less urgent for him than it was for the authors of the early sixth century,⁵⁶⁶ he can feel free to develop a coherent trinitarian-christological terminological system attributing to the term ἐνυπόστατος the same function in both theological contexts. Hence, Maximus' use of our term shows no special connection whatsoever to the ontological status of Christ's human nature or to the insubsistence formula understood in its original sense, but his terminological system coherently integrates Leontius' of Byzantium distinction between ὑπόστασις and ἐνυπόστατον and widely invalidates the equation $x \text{ ἐνυπόστατον} = \text{hypostasis of } x$.

4.2. EXCURSUS: ANASTASIOS SINAITES (AND THE DOCTRINA PATRUM)

From a merely systematic point of view it would be perfectly justified to pass from Maximus immediately to John of Damascus, as other seventh-century authors employing our term, especially Anastasius Sinaites and the compiler of the *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi* formerly identified with Anastasius,⁵⁶⁷ do not display any further development or contribute

⁵⁶⁶ Cf. ab. n. 149.

⁵⁶⁷ Cf. Diekamp's introduction, LXXXIII–LXXXVII and CPG 7781. The impossibility of this identification was already noticed by J. Stiglmayr, *Der Verfasser der Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione verbi*, in: *ByZ* 18 (1909), (14–40) 17–21. To his arguments it can be added that the *Doctrina*-compiler (p. 18) advocates—like Maximus—a twofold divisio vocum, whereas Anastasius always presents a threefold one (*Hodegos* I, 2,76–124; CCG 8, 14–16 and *Op.* VIII; CCG 12, 125–134). Moreover, the wide definition of nature (ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθεια) proposed by Anastasius throughout the entire *Hodegos* (cf. esp. I,3,73–79 and VIII,2,9f.69f.; 5,22.68f. Variants: τὸ ἀληθὲς πρᾶγμα [I, 2,22 f.25; VIII, 5,73 f.], ἀληθὲς πρᾶγματος ὕπαρξις [II,3,4],

any further clarification concerning its usage whatsoever. Nevertheless, the *Doctrina* can serve as an interesting example for how our term was dealt with in the broad tradition of theological compilations, which provided the most important source for later theologians, such as the aforesaid John of Damascus. Examining the rapport between the *Doctrina*-compiler and the authors we dealt with so far, one is astonished to see the amount of material he collected: He did not only hand down to us the name of the author of the *Panhoplion*,⁵⁶⁸ but also preserved in his quotations from Eulogius of Alexandria the entirety of Greek fragments from John the Grammarian's apologetics.⁵⁶⁹ Although the famous passage from Leontius' of Byzantium CNE is not included,⁵⁷⁰ the compiler was fully aware of the distinction between ἐνυπόστατον and hypostasis. His preparation of our *De sectis*-passage⁵⁷¹ obviously

τὸ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ὄν [II, 3,7.41f.], τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀλήθεια [II, 3,9f.], ἀλήθεια [VIII, 5,26f.33.49.76–91], τὸ πᾶν τὸ πεφυκὸς καὶ ὑπάρχον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ [VIII,5,120–122]. φύσει is explained as (ἐν) ἀληθείᾳ or κατὰ ἀλήθειαν in II, 3,19–22.43–45; VIII, 2,29–63; VIII, 5,24f.82–85 and XIV, 2,9, φυσικόν as τὸ ἀληθὺς ἀληθὲς γνωριζόμενον [II, 7,3], ἀλήθινον [VIII, 5,38f.43f.] or τὰ ἀληθῆ τῶν πραγμάτων [ibid. 41]) does not appear in the *Doctrina* (a collection of definitions, on nature esp. in ch. 6 and 22) at all. Finally, Anastasius' persistent polemics against any kind of pagan philosophy (Cf. *Hodegos* I, 3,41–79; II, 3,3–17; VI, 2; VIII, 1,11–42.5,112–127; IX, 2,65–78) seems to be hardly reconcilable with the important role the ἔξωθεν φιλόσοφοι play in the *Doctrina*: They are referred to several times (pp. 44,12.18; 45,11 [alteration of Pamphilus' text]; 137,20f. [inserted in Maximus' text]; 192,1f. [inserted in the *De sectis*-text]; 218,20; 219,1), longer passages from Elias and Stephen of Alexandria (pp. 201,3–202 cf. Elias, *In Isagog.*; CAG XVIII/1, 83,31–84,5.85,4–7.86,2–13 / 202,9–206,16 cf. Stephanus, *In De int.*; CAG XVIII/3, 23,28–20. 61,9–28 [I could not find a parallel to 203,18–204 about privation and habit]) are quoted in fairly free adaptations, the chapter on the difference between φύσις and ὑπόστασις contains two scholia conscribed by the compiler himself on the meaning of those terms κατὰ τοὺς ἔξωθεν φιλοσόφους and several passages on philosophical terminology from Heraclianus and Pamphilus (chap. 6, t. XVI–XXII; 39–47), the chapters 26 and 28 present philosophical discussions about the problem of universals and a description of the concepts of potentiality and actuality, habit and privation. The extensive discussion of Philoponus' account of nature, hypostasis and universals (chap. 36) was added by a later redactor (cf. introd. XXXVII–XXXIX). G. Richter, *Die Dialektik des Johannes von Damaskos. Eine Untersuchung des Textes nach seinen Quellen und seiner Bedeutung*, Ettal 1964, 155 n. 384 claims the t. XVI referred to above to be dependent on the final chapter of Anastasius' *Quaestiones et Responsiones* as they are presented in MSG 89 (824B/C). According to Richard's analysis of the manuscript tradition of those *Quaestiones*, this is impossible for chronological reasons alone ("Les véritables 'Questions et Réponses' d'Anastase le Sinaïte", in: *Opera Minora* III, Turnhout 1977, [43–56] 41.52f.).

⁵⁶⁸ *Doctrina*, 44,25–45,9 = *Panhoplion* II,64–79 (CCG 19, 136f.); *Doctrina*, 45,11–46,6 = II,120–154 (CCG 19, 139–141, considerably altered!); *Doctrina*, 46,9–47,14 = XI,1–41 (CCG 19, 201f.).

⁵⁶⁹ Ibid., 69,17–71,15; 193,17–198,20; 205,20–206,28; 214,28–216,4; 220,15–221,15. The paragraph on the twofold meaning of hypostasis or ἐνυπόστατον is to be found on 198,9–20.

⁵⁷⁰ The original *Doctrina* (chap. 1–31) comprises Leontius' thirty chapters against Severus (pp. 155,11–164,3) and one passage from his *Epilysis* (pp. 198,24–199,12 = MSG 86/2, 1932A/B).

⁵⁷¹ Ibid., 191,21–193,12. The five citations from the *Scholia Leontii* which gave rise to the

shows his attempt to reconcile the two traditions of using our term, ‘twofold use’- (John the Grammarian, *De sectis*) and ‘distinction’-tradition (Leontius, Pamphilus, Maximus), which he might have become acquainted with from Maximus, *Ep.* 15, a text he presents in a considerably altered, but not adulterated, version.⁵⁷² As Richard has shown,⁵⁷³ the compiler’s glossed version of the *De sectis*-text aims at restricting the use of ἐνυπόστατος by attributing ‘more proper’ terms to every one of its meanings as distinguished by *De sectis*: According to its first meaning, it is said to comprise substances—which are more properly called αὐθὺπαρκα or αὐθυπόστατα—and accidents which are more properly (χυριώτερον) called ἑτεροῦπόστατα.⁵⁷⁴ According to its second meaning, it primarily refers to individual substances which are not properly ἐνυπόστατα, “but are rather hypostases and perceived as such” (ἀλλ’ ὑποστάσεις μᾶλλον εἰσὶ τε καὶ γνωρίζονται)⁵⁷⁵—an implicit, but nevertheless clear interpolation of the distinction between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον into the *De sectis*-text. Maybe also as a concession to the Leontius-tradition, our compiler consequently omits the passages, where the natures are called ἀνυπόστατοι. However, he also tries to do justice to the other tradition in connecting the statement about the twofold ecclesiastical usage of ὑπόστασις directly with a slightly altered quotation from John the Grammarian.⁵⁷⁶ He might even show some awareness of the philosophical parallels for this distinction in employing the phrase ἀπλῶς ὑπαρξίς for the wider use.⁵⁷⁷ At all events, he is acquainted with the connection between our term and the ‘no nature without hypostasis’ objection, as he not only uses it as an introductory phrase to the text from Maximus, *Ep.* 15,⁵⁷⁸ but also quotes it in the

Loofian ‘Grundschriftypothese’ are according to Junglas (Leontius, 6–9) and Richard (*De sectis*, 712–721) nothing but more or less freely adapted excerpts from *De sectis: Doctrina*, 213,6–214,24 and 217,17–218,5(13) cite without major alterations *De sectis* VII (1248D–1249D.1244B/C). *Doctrina*, 111,14–114,25; 177,22–179,11 and 191,21–193,12 offer considerably transformed versions of *De sectis* X (1260B–1261D); VI (1233C–D.1236D–1237B/C) and VII (1240C–1241A.C).

⁵⁷² *Doctrina*, 137,1–138,15.

⁵⁷³ *De sectis*, 715–721.

⁵⁷⁴ αὐθυπόστατον—ἑτεροῦπόστατον: the philosophical, not the theological opposition (cf. ab. n. 448)! Another interesting feature of the *Doctrina*-revision is also the clear indication of the derivative character of the second use of ἀνυπόστατον (cf. 192,14–16).

⁵⁷⁵ *Doctrina*, 191,21–192,9.

⁵⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 192,18–193,7 cf. John’s *Apology* VI, 6,191–211; CCG 1, 55 f. (cf. ab. n. 152).

⁵⁷⁷ *Doctrina*, 192,18 f. cf. 39,19–23; 40,2 f.

⁵⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 137,2. The Maximus-quotation is made up as follows: 137,4–7 = *Ep.* 15 (557D15–560A4). 137,9 f. cf. 557D4–7. 137,12 f. = 557D8 f. 137,14 f. cf. 560A8 f. 137,19–22 = 557D12–15. 137,22–138,6 = 560B7–C6. 138,6–15 = 556C9–D6.

heading of chapter 27, where the relevant citations from *De sectis* and John the Grammarian (Eulogius) are gathered.⁵⁷⁹

In contrast, in the case of Anastasius, none of the numerous parallels Uthemann adduces seem—in my opinion—sufficient to establish a direct literary connection to Leontius of Byzantium, Pamphilus, Leontius of Jerusalem (who was of course not mentioned by the *Doctrina* either) or the *De sectis*.⁵⁸⁰ Due to his historical research about the Monophysite movement, Anastasius was of course informed about the controversy between Severus and John the Grammarian, but was apparently not in possession of any primary source.⁵⁸¹ At any rate, among the numerous strategies he offers to refute the ‘no nature without hypostasis’ objection there is not a single trace of the relevant traditions concerning our term. Already the final chapter of the collection of definitions in the *Hodegos* (II, 8,138–152) deals with this “notorious objection of all the monophysites” (πολυθρύλητον πρόβλημα πάντων τῶν Μονοφυσιτῶν) and offers the following strategy to solve it: If the Monophysites admit a twofold begetting in Christ, they will also have to claim one offspring to be ἀνυπόστατος or admit a duality of offspring. In VI, 2,15–17 the objection is—alongside with the identification between nature and person—rejected as one of the many errors originating in the heretics’ reading of Aristotle’s *Categories*. Anastasius’ biblical proof for the non-identity of nature and person (VIII,2) culminates in accusing his oppo-

⁵⁷⁹ *Doctrina*, 191,16–18. An interesting fact about the composition of this chapter is the insertion of a short phrase from Cyril of Alexandria between the two long quotations from *De sectis* and John/Eulogius: Τὸ γὰρ τοι μὴ ὑφεστός ἐν ἴσῳ τῷ μηδενί, μᾶλλον δὲ παντελῶς οὐδέν. (De incarnatione unigeniti, ed. G.M. de Durand, Paris 1964 [SC 97], 214) Is this passage intended to underscore the necessity of attributing—if not a hypostasis—at least some kind of subsistence to Christ’s human nature?

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. the indices fontium in CCG 8 and *Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis necnon opuscula adversus Monotheletas*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, Turnhout 1985 (CCG 12). One passage in his anthologies he cites from Amphilochius in fact belongs to Ephrem of Amid (*Hodegos* X,1,153–157; CCG 8, 155 f.). A dependence on the anthology of CM is also possible (cf. Uthemann’s index fontium, CCG 8, 429 f.). Although Maximus is not mentioned in his short history of the monotheletic controversy (*Op.* III,1,18–112; CCG 12, 56–61), Anastasius must have known the most important theologian of his time. His emphasis on the ἀσπορία of Christ is most probably due to the influence of Maximus’ writings. Cf. *Op.* I,1,89–91 (CCG 12, 11); II, 3,19 f.23 (p. 43); V,16 (p. 99). 42 (p. 100); *Op.* VII,1,16–19 (p. 125, ref. *Div. nom.* II,9); IX,1,85 f. (p. 139) / *Hodegos* II,7,45 f. (p. 62); IV,59 (p. 84); XIII,4,23 (p. 222, ref. *Div. nom.* II,9):30.48 (p. 223). 7,110 f. (p. 240); XXII,2,56 (p. 295), but especially II,5,40–52 (CCG 8, 52 f.) and XIII,5,1–25 (pp. 225 f., the paragraphs about the χαριστομία; cf. Maximus, *Amb.* 41, *Amb.* 7 [1096A], *Ep.* 19 [592C/D]).

⁵⁸¹ Cf. *Hodegos* VI,1,21 f.30 f. (CCG 8, 94 f.).116–121 (*Ibid.*, 99). In the last passage, he claims to have received his information in Babylon from Athanasius the secretary. If he had been in possession of a copy of John’s apology, he would most probably have mentioned it there.

nents of ignoring clear biblical testimony in claiming that there is no φύσις ἀπρόσωπος (VIII,2,79–86). IX,2 is analogously structured and accuses our heretics of shunning all the orthodox fathers and agreeing with the ancient heretics in raising this stupid objection (48–60). The alleged Severian postulate of terminological non-identity of trinitarian and Christological language restricting the objection to the Christological context is sarcastically welcomed and without further refutation employed as an introduction to the report about the four disputes with the Monophysites in Alexandria (X). According to Anastasius' report about the first one of those disputes, he tricked his opponents beforehand "in a certain hypocrisy of pious knavery" (X.1,1,26f.) and made them agree to the presupposition of substituting 'person' for 'nature' in every authoritative Christological text on the basis of our objection (X.1,34–36.42–44). Thus, he has little trouble in subjecting the objection and the whole monophysite position to a *reductio ad absurdum* by presenting those passages from the fathers which speak explicitly of two natures (X.1,2).⁵⁸² In the beginning of the second dispute, the Monophysites are said to have reinforced our objection by pointing to the texts of Cyril of Alexandria where the natures are called hypostases (X.2,1,12–17). Of course, Anastasius was once again much too cunning for his opponents and tricked them a second time on the basis of those Cyril-passages speaking of two ὑποστάσεις in Christ which—taken for granted the synonymous use of hypostasis, nature and person—could only be understood in a Nestorian way (X.2,3).⁵⁸³ Anastasius can thus just continue quoting Cyril and manifesting the absurd consequence of the monophysite objection (X.2,3,38–40). The rest of the dispute is mainly concerned with a confrontation of the Monophysite and the Anastasian concept of nature. The objection is only resumed one other time (X.2,5,5–13), when Anastasius briefly alludes to the lack of coherence between the trinitarian and Christological terminology caused by the Monophysites' identification of nature and person.⁵⁸⁴ The

⁵⁸² The objection is resumed in X.1, 2,13f.27f.81f.103f.109f. and 196.

⁵⁸³ Accordingly, also the second chapter against the Monophysites ("Antimonophysitische Aporien des Anastasius Sinaites", ed. K.-H. Uthemann, in: *ByZ* 74 [1981], [11–26] 23) refutes the objection by the supposition of hypostasis and person for nature in the monophysite ἐκ δύο φύσεων-formula.

⁵⁸⁴ This is a standard motive in the Neochalcedonian polemics against the Monophysites from its beginnings. Although some texts of Severus' (Cf. the fragment preserved in Leontius of Byzantium, *Epitylisis*; MSG 86/II,1921B and the letter to John Hegoumenos preserved by the *Doctrina*, 309f.) actually claim the necessity of a new Christological terminology and thus apparently justify the reproach, Severus' most extensive account of dogmatic terminology (*Contra impium grammaticum* II,1–5; CSCO 111,55–84/112,43–66) offers nothing like that.

short fourth dispute (X.4) exclusively deals with our objection again, but only restates the point about Cyril speaking of hypostases in Christ made in X.2,3. In XXI,1, the second dispute is resumed as to the possibility of calling Christ's body φύσις, but our objection only plays the role of the Monophysite's reason for his denial of this possibility (XXI,1,32–35.39f.).

This survey has shown that the refutation of our objection on the basis of a distinction between nature and person forms the central topic of Anastasius' *Hodegos*. However, his argumentation rests almost exclusively on the authoritative usage of the fathers and does not present anything like the refined discussions of the Leontii or Maximus—and not a single allusion to a distinction between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατος or any exceptional use of this term. Accordingly, his use of ἐνυπόστατος hardly presents any feature of systematic interest. There is one instance of the traditional trinitarian use,⁵⁸⁵ one Christological passage stressing the reality of Christ's flesh⁵⁸⁶ and five other instances where our term is used in the sense of 'true, real' as opposed to merely verbal or imaginary.⁵⁸⁷ That our term is nevertheless included in the collection of definitions forming the second book of the *Hodegos* can only be motivated by a traditional canon of terms Anastasius follows in composing this collection. The passage reads:

Accordingly, with regard to Philoxenus' letter to the monks of Senoun A. de Halleux claims that the latter "applique avec une parfaite conséquence la même terminologie 'technique' aux deux mystères de la Trinité et de l'Incarnation" (*Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, ed. A. de Halleux, Louvain 1963 [CSCO 232], XVII). The criticism of a terminological "Vogel-Strauß-Politik" (Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 29) still raised against the Monophysites by patristic scholars most probably needs to be carefully differentiated.

⁵⁸⁵ *Hodegos* XXII, 2,95–97 (CCG 8, 296): ὁ μὲν λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνυπόστατος θεὸς ἐστίν, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ θεός ἐστι καὶ ὑπόστασις θεοῦ.

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid. XIII, 7,150–152 (p. 242): Ἐκὼν δέ σοι πάρεμι σιγήσων (scil. in my list of arguments for a real human energy in Christ) τὴν τῶν θρόμβων τοῦ αἵματος καὶ τῆς πλευράς εἰς γῆν ἐξ Ἰησοῦ κατάρρυσίν τε καὶ ἐξ ἐνυποστάτου σαρκὸς θεοῦ ἀφαίρεσιν.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid. XII, 3,6–8 (p. 205): οὐκέτι ῥηματικῶς καὶ γραφικῶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς παρεταξάμεθα, ἀλλὰ πραγματικῶς διὰ παραδείγματος καὶ σχήματος ἐνυποστάτου / *Op.* I, 5,4–6 (CCG 12, 24f.): τὴν Τριάδα ἐπίγνωθι δι' ἐνυποστάτων πραγμάτων· ὑπὲρ γὰρ πάσαν ἄλλην νομικὴν καὶ γραφικὴν μαρτυρίαν βεβαιότερα αὕτη / *Op.* X, 5,98f. (Ibid., 157): οὐ διὰ ῥημάτων, ἀλλὰ διὰ καρδιακῶν καὶ ἐνυποστάτων πραγμάτων καὶ ἐνεργημάτων / *Quaest.* 81, 6,45f. (ed. M. Richard/J.A. Munitiz, Turnhout 2006 [CCG 59], 134): ἐνυπόστατον καὶ ἀψευδῆ παραγάγω παράστασιν. In *Quaest.* 21, 4f. the meaning shifts between 'true, real' (21, 4,41f.; CCG 59, 40: ἐνυπόστατος καὶ ἀφαντασίαστος ἦν ἡ ἐμὴ τῆς ψυχῆς ὑπαρξίς) and 'endowed with independent existence' (21, 5,45f.; CCG 59, 40: ἀκουσον τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον καὶ ἀθάνατον τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς διδάσκοντος).

We do not call the flesh of Christ person, but substance, in order to signify that he assumed and saved our entire nature. For if we call it hypostasis, we are caught in claiming that Christ assumed and saved one single man. However, the flesh also cannot be called hypostasis, insofar as it is inseparable from the God-Logos. We call it *ἐνυπόστατον*, but not hypostasis; for the *ἐνυπόστατον* is what exists (*τὸ ὑπάρχον*), just as the *ἀνυπόστατον* is what does not have any existence or substance: e.g. a thing seen in sleep (*ἐνύπνιον*) is without substance and subsistence (*ἀνούσιον καὶ ἀνυπόστατον*), (only) imaginary. And in order to say it in a definition: Without subsistence, existence and substance (*ἀνυπόστατον καὶ ἀνύπαρκτον καὶ ἀνούσιον*) is what is—despite being verbally pronounced very often—not perceived in substance or subsistence, just like Hades, death or illness. (II, 3, 112–126)

This passage seems to resume the ‘distinction’-tradition only at first sight, as it starts off by protesting against the disadvantageous consequence it must yield for a Chalcedonian, i.e. having to call Christ’s natures also hypostases in some sense. This consequence is, however, not avoided here by a sharp terminological distinction between ‘hypostasis’ and *ἐνυπόστατον*, but—in full accord with the ‘twofold-use’-tradition—by generalizing the meaning of *ἐνυπόστατον*: Being the (privative) opposite of *ἀνυπόστατον*, i.e. the completely inexistent and imaginary, it has to mean any kind of existence or reality. Obviously, this is perfectly in line with Anastasius’ concept of nature as *ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθεια*. However, it also deprives our term of all the technical specification it had received in Maximus and can thus only be described as a retrogression in its development. Yet, this is not all Anastasius has to say about our term. He also distinguishes a twofold meaning of it analogous to that of *ἐνούσιος*:

Again, we call *ἐνούσιον* either the being itself or the property perceived in a substance, just as ‘reasonable’ and ‘perishable’ are *ἐνούσιον* for human beings. Accordingly, also *ἐνυπόστατον* is said in a twofold way, either (referring to) the truly existent entity or to the property in the hypostasis, like ‘unbegotten’ in the Father, ‘begotten’ in the Son, ‘proceeded’ in the Holy Spirit, as it was said above. (II, 3, 126–133)

This is more or less identical with Ephrem’s distinction⁵⁸⁸ and reveals a second reason for referring *ἐνυπόστατος* to the hypostatical properties apart from etymology: its synonymous treatment with *ὑποστατικὸς* corresponding to that of *ἐνούσιος* and *οὐσιώδης*. The reference in the last lines of the citation points to II, 3, 73, where Anastasius informs us about the *ὑποστατικαὶ ιδιότητες* of the trinitarian persons, a traditional expression occurring

⁵⁸⁸ Cf. ab. n. 340.

quite often in Anastasius.⁵⁸⁹ While the alleged synonymy or ἐνούσιος and οὐσιώδης is displayed by Anastasius himself in his *Op.* I, 4,10 f.29 f., where he claims the soul to have its logos οὐσιωδῶς ἐν ἑαυτῇ or ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἐνούσιον, I was unable to find any reference for ἐνυπόστατοι ιδιότητες or ιδιώματα.⁵⁹⁰ Only the hypostatic union can be called both ἔνωσις ἐνυπόστατος and ὑποστατική or be described as ἐνυποστάτως or ὑποστατικῶς ἐνούσθαι.⁵⁹¹ Anastasius is thus most probably relying on a 'lexicographical' tradition finally going back as far as Ephrem of Amid.

4.3. JOHN OF DAMASCUS

John of Damascus' work is still regarded as "something of a digest of the whole Eastern tradition, summarizing (and sometimes appropriating verbatim) a vast theological and philosophical heritage".⁵⁹² However, the analyses of Studer and especially Richter have shown with regard to the philosophical heritage that John was nothing but a compiler in the strictest sense. His philosophical treatises depend on philosophical introductions and excerpts from the Alexandrian commentators composed by and for theologians, who did not have any profound acquaintance with philosophical matters.⁵⁹³ In principle, Studer and Richter extend this judgement to John's relationship to the theological tradition, even if they admit a slightly higher degree of appropriation of the collected material here.⁵⁹⁴ Admittedly, the widespread

⁵⁸⁹ Cf. *Hodegos* II, 4,38 f. (CCG 8, 41); XVI,26 (p. 269); XVI,48 (p. 270, in a quotation); XVII,15-33-36 (p. 272); XVI,44 (p. 270) / *Op.* I,3,38 (CCG 12, 19).

⁵⁹⁰ On Maximus, *Ep.* 15 (557A) cf. ab. n. 512.

⁵⁹¹ For the latter phrase cf. *Hodegos* XVI,44 (CCG 8, 270); XX,45 f.53 (pp. 281 f.).

⁵⁹² R. Cross, "Perichoresis, Deification, and Christological predication in John of Damascus", in: *Medieval Studies* 62 (2000), (69–124) 69. In quoting John of Damascus we use the abbreviations listed *ibid.*, n. 1.

⁵⁹³ Cf. B. Studer, *Die theologische Arbeitsweise des Johannes von Damaskus*, Ettal 1956, 102–125 and Richter, *Dialektik*, esp. 235–242.268–280. For a more sympathetic account of John as a philosopher cf. C. Erisman, "A world of hypostases. John of Damascus' rethinking of Aristotle's categorical ontology", in: *Studia Patristica* 50 (2011), 269–287.

⁵⁹⁴ Cf. Studer, *Theologische Arbeitsweise*, 123: "Johannes bringt gegenüber den kirchlichen Schriftstellern des sechsten und siebten Jahrhunderts, denen er durchwegs verpflichtet ist, kaum etwas Neues. Im Gegenteil, er steht ihnen bereits ordentlich nach, wie auch ein nur oberflächlicher Vergleich mit deren Werken zeigt." Richter (*Dialektik*, 28–36) shows accurately that the Nemesius and Maximus-quotations in John's account of man and creation in *Expos.* are not drawn from the original sources, but from some intermediate compilation. However, his extension of this observation to the whole work of John (*ibid.*, 238. 241) seems precipitate in my opinion. Studer, *Theologische Arbeitsweise*, 91 f. and Rozemond, *Christologie*, 34–39 take John's direct acquaintance with Maximus for granted.

use of anthologies and compilations casts doubt on every literal quotation with regard to its origin in a direct use of the source or an acquaintance conveyed by an anthology. As those anthologies and compilations were continuously copying one another and thus overlapping to a large extent, Richter can even raise doubts against John's use of the *Doctrina patrum*, which was commonly accepted since Diekamp.⁵⁹⁵ In this case, the only reasonable method is to take every single relevant passage on its own and decide whether it displays a more profound understanding of the tradition resumed in it or just adds an undigested piece of traditional knowledge to the vast collection embodied in John's Πηγὴ γνώσεως.

4.3.1. ἐνυπόστατος in John of Damascus

4.3.1.1. The Trinitarian Usage

With respect to the traditional trinitarian use of ἐνυπόστατος, we encounter a comprehensive resumption of almost the entire complex of motives connected with the term during the fourth-century-debate. In *Expos.* 6, John opposes the human λόγος προφορικός and the divine Λόγος ἐνυπόστατος, just as Eusebius of Caesarea's Origenist companions did, and infers—following John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria—the hypostatical reality of God's Logos from his consubstantiality with the Father,⁵⁹⁶ an argument which recurs two chapters later in *Expos.* 8.⁵⁹⁷ This chapter also resumes another motive from Cyril's trinitarian treatises: The Son is not a dead instrument of the creating Father without real connection to him, but his ἐνυπόστατος (σοφία καὶ) δύναμις.⁵⁹⁸ Moreover, it extends—perhaps also inspired by Cyril—the inference of hypostatical reality from consubstantiality also to the Spirit.⁵⁹⁹

⁵⁹⁵ Dialektik, 238–242 cf. *Doctrina*, LXVI–LXXIV and the indices of parallels in *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. B. Kotter, vol. 2, Berlin 1973 (PTS 12), 252f. and vol. 4, Berlin 1981 (PTS 22), 446f.

⁵⁹⁶ *Expos.* 6,4–11 (PTS 12, 15) cf. ab. nn. 108 and 113. This passage resembles one of Cyril's corresponding accounts in the *Thesaurus* (MSG 75, 324A). The possibility of Ps-Cyril being in fact John's source is refuted by V.S. Conticello, "Pseudo-Cyril's 'De SS. Trinitate': A Compilation of Joseph the Philosopher", in: OCP 61 (1995), 117–129, who shows the treatise to be a part of Joseph's († ca. 1330) encyclopedia compiled from John's *Expositio* and Nicephorus' Blemmydes *Sermo ad monachos suos*.

⁵⁹⁷ *Expos.* 8,108–112 (PTS 12, 23).

⁵⁹⁸ *Ibid.* 8,38–43.156–162 (*Ibid.*, 20.25).

⁵⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 8,181–187 (p. 26) cf. Cyril, *Thesaurus* (MSG 75, 580A.596B).

Small wonder we find John employing the phrases ἐνυπόστατος λόγος,⁶⁰⁰ ἐνυπόστατος σοφία⁶⁰¹ or δύναμις⁶⁰² in various combinations⁶⁰³ mainly for the Son, but also for the spirit,⁶⁰⁴ lots of times also in other works. We also find three instances of what we labelled ‘doxological use’: Christ is once called ἐνυπόστατος ζωή,⁶⁰⁵ twice ἐνυπόστατος ἀλήθεια.⁶⁰⁶ The validity of the equation $x \text{ ἐνυπόστατος} = \text{ὑπόστασις of } x$ is beautifully displayed by John’s parallel use of ἐνυπόστατος and ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει ὑφίστασθαι or ὑπάρχειν.⁶⁰⁷ The only passage in John resuming Maximus’ technical trinitarian use⁶⁰⁸ is *Ctr. Jac.* 12,4–13, where the ἐνυπόστατος οὐσία and the ὑποστάσεις ἐνούσιοι of the Trinity are said to correspond to the οὐσαὶ ἐνυπόστατοι and the ὑπόστασις ἐνούσιος of the incarnation. All the other ‘trinitarian’ instances call—according to the older tradition—the (second and third) hypostases ἐνυπόστατος, not the divine substance.

4.3.1.2. The Christological Usage

K. Rozemond claimed “la notion d’enhypostasie” to be the systematic basis of John’s Christology, the necessary prerequisite for understanding every single one of his Christological statements.⁶⁰⁹ We will have to examine

⁶⁰⁰ *Dial. fus.* 1,68; ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1969 (PTS 7), 55 / *Expos.* 13,95 (PTS 12, 41) / *Ctr. Man.* 9,12 f. (PTS 22, 309) / *Hom. in transf.* 13,5; ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1988, (PTS 29), 450 / *Hom. in ficum* 1,1 (PTS 29, 102) / *Hom. in sab.* 4,2 (PTS 29, 123) / *Enc. in Chrys.* 3,2 (PTS 29, 360) / *Hom. in Dorm.* III 2,43 f. (PTS 29, 551).

⁶⁰¹ *Dial. fus.* 1,20 (PTS 7, 53) / *Volunt.* 3,16 (PTS 22, 176).

⁶⁰² *Expos.* 54,5 (PTS 12, 129); 87,70 (*Ibid.*, 201) / *Ctr. Jac.* 85,3 (PTS 22, 141) / *Epist. de trishag.* 3,31 (PTS 22, 309) / *Hom. in sab.* 4,10 (PTS 29, 123) / *Enc. in Chrys.* 2,8 (PTS 29, 360). This is again strongly reminiscent of Cyril’s usage (cf. ab. n. 117).

⁶⁰³ The Son can be called—alluding to 1 Cor 1:24—“personified wisdom and power” (*Expos.* 46,20 [PTS 12, 109]; 84,33 [PTS 12, 187]; 91,28 [PTS 12, 213] / *Ctr. Nest.* 43,43 [PTS 22, 287] / *Hom. in Nativ.* 2,15 f. [PTS 29, 326]), the Son and the Spirit can be called “hypostatical” (*Ctr. Nest.* 43,19 [PTS 22, 286] / *Epist. de trishag.* 28,41 [PTS 22, 332]) or “personified powers” (*Epist. de trishag.* 7,21 [PTS 22, 315]; 25,26 [*Ibid.*, 328]; 28,30 [*Ibid.*, 331]). Only one passage in the *Sacra parallela* also includes the Father (MSG 95, 1076B).

⁶⁰⁴ *Expos.* 13,88 (PTS 12, 41) / *Hom. in sab.* 4,13 (PTS 29, 123).

⁶⁰⁵ *Expos.* 59,155 (PTS 12, 150). Cf. ab. n. 44.

⁶⁰⁶ *De imag.* 1 3,22; ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1975 (PTS 17), 68 / *Ctr. Nest.* 17,14 (PTS 22, 269). Cf. ab. n. 27.

⁶⁰⁷ *Expos.* 8,184 (PTS 12, 26) / *Epist. de trishag.* 28,30 (PTS 22, 331).

⁶⁰⁸ Cf. ab. n. 498.

⁶⁰⁹ Christologie, 22. The “triple but” of the concept she summarizes her analyses in on p. 26 only makes sense in referring this “notion” to the term ἐνυπόστατος (“un seul mot”). As our analysis below will show, the term—despite being very closely connected to the insubistence formula, the true key concept of John’s Christology—is not identical with or completely inseparable from it. Rozemond’s claim is thus with all its implications clearly an overstatement.

whether this holds true only for the insubistence concept, or also for the term ἐνυπόστατος, or for none of them. The passages in John's work reflecting explicitly upon our term can be divided into two groups: The first is represented by two passages from the *Dialectics*, *Dial. fus.* 30 (= *Dial. brev.* 10) and 45, which deal with the term rather formally without always making the relevant theological context explicit. The second group almost entirely coincides with the Christological debates of the 'no nature without hypostasis' objection to be found in *Expos.* 53, *Ctr. Jac.* 11f. and *Ctr. Aceph.* 5f.⁶¹⁰

Dial. fus. 30 offers a concise description of the twofold use of hypostasis, ἐνυπόστατος, and ἀνυπόστατος, just as it was postulated by John the Grammarian and the *De sectis*.⁶¹¹ This distinction—based upon the validity of the equation referred to above—is repeated a bit more extensively in *Dial. fus.* 43 (= *Dial. brev.* 26) about 'hypostasis'. However, the ending of chap. 45, which presents the Christological application of our term, clearly follows Leontius' of Byzantium distinction between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον.⁶¹² Following the *Doctrina patrum*, this chapter obviously tries to reconcile those two traditions and deserves a closer look.

45,1–7 presents the attempt—well known from the *Doctrina*—to harmonize Leontius of Byzantium and *De sectis* by assigning a 'more proper' term to every one of the meanings distinguished by the latter text: The accident is ἑτεροῦπόστατον rather than ἐνυπόστατον, the independent individual is rather hypostasis. John (or his source) seems to omit the *Doctrina*'s attribution of αὐθυπόστατος to the substance in order to have also a proper meaning left for ἐνυπόστατον, not just some variation of derived ones.

45,7–16 expounds Maximus' two kinds of ἐνυπόστατον, yet without betraying any influence of the *Doctrina*-version of Maximus. The *Doctrina* 'pedagogically' rearranges Maximus' text by presenting first the formal distinction between the two kinds and in immediate connection with the second one its Christological application, whereas John—probably inspired by the archetype of Maximus' distinction, the famous passage from Leontius of Byzantium (1280B)—inserts the example of man as an illustrative application.⁶¹³ His harmonizing strategy follows the *Doctrina*, but is carried through

⁶¹⁰ The only passage where the objection is properly discussed without reference to our term is *De fide ctr. Nest.* 6–10 (PTS 22, 239f.). Allusions to it can be found in *Haer.* 83a, 136–154 (PTS 22, 54) and *Ctr. Jac.* 80 (PTS 22, 137f.).

⁶¹¹ Cf. ab. nn. 152f. and 400.

⁶¹² *Dial. fus.* 45,19f. (PTS 7, 110): οὐχ ὑπόστασις ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐνυπόστατον.

⁶¹³ Cf. Maximus, *Ep.* 15 (557D/560A; ab. nn. 511–514); *Doctrina*, 137,3–16 (ab. nn. 572–575).

more consequently: In a way similar to the *Doctrina's De sectis*-version, John accentuates the meaning he assigns to ἐνυπόστατος (Maximus' two kinds) and 'hypostasis' as κυρίως (7.15), thus both leaving room for the less specific, synonymous usage as improper or derived, and overcoming the ambiguity of the *Doctrina* regarding the proper meaning of both terms.⁶¹⁴

Of the utmost interest in the present context is, however, the final paragraph (45,17–22), which applies our term to Christology in referring it explicitly to the insubsistence of Christ's human nature in the Logos. Why does John present this as a special meaning of the term, detached from Maximus' second kind, which was designed exactly to meet this need for an interpretation of the term applicable to Christ's insubsisting natures? An answer to this question could be provided by what is probably the closest parallel to *Dial. fus.* 45, the final paragraph from the "other chapter":

ἐνυπόστατον sometimes signifies being, sometimes the individual.⁶¹⁵ Properly ἐνυπόστατον is, however, either the infima species, because it is not perceived by itself, but in its hypostases, or that which is composed with another substantially different thing in order to create a whole, just as man is composed of body and soul: Neither the soul nor the body is called hypostasis, but ἐνυπόστατα, because neither of them did ever subsist before or apart from the other, but what is completed from both of them is their hypostasis. Therefore also the flesh of the Lord is not called hypostasis, but ἐνυπόστατον, because it never subsisted by itself, but in the hypostasis of the Logos, and received and possesses it as its hypostasis.⁶¹⁶

The parallel in John says:

Properly ἐνυπόστατον is either that which does not subsist by itself, but is perceived in the hypostases, as the species or the nature of man is not perceived

⁶¹⁴ An alternative harmonizing strategy is offered by the *Codex Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct.* T.1.6 12,9–16 (PTS 7, 165), an anonymous compilation of excerpts which according to Richter (*Dialektik*, 23–39) is temporally prior to the *Doctrina*. The codex faithfully reproduces Maximus' two kinds of ἐνυπόστατον according to the wording of *Ep.* 15 (and the *Doctrina*) (12,9–11). Then it attaches the distinction between the wider and narrower use in assigning ἐνυπόστατος to the wider and ὑπόστασις to the narrower one. Thus, it subordinates the 'twofold use tradition' to the 'distinction tradition'.

⁶¹⁵ A very condensed version of the 'twofold use'-tradition (cf. *Dial. fus.* 45,1–7), immediately dismissed by the "proper" use according to the 'distinction'-tradition.

⁶¹⁶ *Other chapter* 123–129 (PTS 7, 146): Τὸ ἐνυπόστατον ποτὲ μὲν τὸ ὄν σημαίνει, ποτὲ δὲ τὸ ἄτομον. Κυρίως δὲ ἐνυπόστατόν ἐστιν ἢ τὸ εἰδικώτατον εἶδος διὰ τὸ μὴ καθ' ἑαυτὸ θεωρεῖσθαι ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ὑποστάσεσιν, ἢ τὸ σὺν ἄλλῳ διαφόρῳ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν εἰς ὅλου τινὸς γένεσιν συντιθέμενον, οἷον ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐστὶ καὶ σώματος. Οὕτε ἡ ψυχὴ λέγεται ὑπόστασις οὔτε τὸ σῶμα ἀλλ' ἐνυπόστατα, ὅτι οὐδέποτε ὑπέστη τὸ ἐν πρὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου οὐδὲ ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἐτέρου, τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἀποτελούμενον ὑπόστασις ἀμφοτέρων ἐστίν. Ὅθεν καὶ ἡ τοῦ κυρίου σὰρξ οὐχ ὑπόστασις λέγεται ἀλλ' ἐνυπόστατον, ἐπειδὴ οὐδέποτε καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑπέστη ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοῦ λόγου ὑποστάσει, καὶ αὐτὴν ἔσχεν καὶ ἔχει ὑπόστασιν.

in its own hypostasis, but in Peter, Paul and the hypostases of the remaining people, or that which is composed with another substantially different thing in order to create a whole and thus produces a single composite hypostasis, just as man is composed of soul and body. Neither is the soul on its own called hypostasis nor is the body, but (they are called) *ἐνυπόστατα*. What is completed from both is their hypostasis. For hypostasis is and is called properly what subsists by itself and independently.

Again, one calls *ἐνυπόστατος* the nature which is assumed by a different hypostasis and received its existence in it. Therefore also the flesh of the Lord—which did not subsist by itself, not even for a single moment—is not a hypostasis, but *ἐνυπόστατον*. For it received its subsistence in the hypostasis of the God Logos, because it was assumed by it and received and possesses it as its hypostasis.⁶¹⁷

Despite the numerous literal agreements, the “other chapter” as a whole can according to Richter neither be regarded as a source for nor as an excerpt from John, but both are drawing on a broader tradition.⁶¹⁸ The crucial point is whether this common source connected—as one would expect—the Neochalcedonian Christological application of the term directly with the description of the composite hypostasis (Maximus’ second kind) like the “other chapter” or, like John, differentiated between the two concepts: the strictly Chalcedonian one applicable to both natures and the Neochalcedonian one only applicable to the human nature. In my opinion, it is more likely that John’s version is a correction of the “other-chapter”-version than that the latter is a simplified version of the former, though one cannot be absolutely certain about this. Yet, the phrase *καὶ μίαν ἀποτελοῦν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον* in *Dial. fus.* 45,11 f. strongly suggests that in John’s source this meaning of the term was designed for the Christological purpose, not a later one still to be added. Moreover, the “other chapter”-version conflates Leontius and Maximus in that it conceives of the human hypostasis as an example of

⁶¹⁷ *Dial. fus.* 45,7–22 (PTS 7, 110): Κυρίως δὲ ἐνυπόστατόν ἐστιν ἢ τὸ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ μὲν μὴ ὑφιστάμενον ἀλλ’ ἐν ταῖς ὑποστάσεσι θεωρούμενον, ὥσπερ τὸ εἶδος ἡγουν ἢ φύσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει οὐ θεωρεῖται ἀλλ’ ἐν Πέτρῳ καὶ Παύλῳ καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑποστάσεσιν, ἢ τὸ σὺν ἄλλῳ διαφόρῳ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν εἰς ὅλου τινὸς γένεσιν συντιθέμενον καὶ μίαν ἀποτελοῦν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον, οἷον ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐστὶ καὶ σώματος συντεθειμένος· οὔτε ἡ ψυχὴ μόνῃ λέγεται ὑπόστασις οὔτε τὸ σῶμα ἀλλ’ ἐνυπόστατα, τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἀποτελούμενον ὑπόστασις ἀμφοτέρων. Ὑπόστασις γὰρ κυρίως τὸ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ ἰδιοσυστάτως ὑφιστάμενόν ἐστὶ τε καὶ λέγεται. Λέγεται πάλιν ἐνυπόστατον ἢ ὑφ’ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως προσληφθεῖσα φύσις καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐσχηκυῖα τὴν ὑπαρξιν. Ὅθεν καὶ ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου μὴ ὑποστάσα καθ’ ἑαυτὴν μὴ δὲ πρὸς καιροῦ ῥοπὴν οὐχ ὑπόστασις ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐνυπόστατόν ἐστιν· ἐν γὰρ τῇ ὑποστάσει τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ὑπέστη προσληφθεῖσα ὑπ’ αὐτῆς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ἔσχε καὶ ἔχει ὑπόστασιν.

⁶¹⁸ *Dialektik*, 219–221.

the second kind of ἐνυπόστατον (Leontius' 'second kind' of hypostasis) not, like Maximus, as example of the first kind.⁶¹⁹ In full accord with Maximus, John will have become aware of the difficulties resulting from such a connection: The "other chapter" denies a hypostasis of their own to the human soul and body, because they do not subsist temporally or locally separate from each other, and infers from that that Christ's human nature can neither have such a hypostasis of its own, because it never subsisted temporally or locally separate from the Logos. Such a temporal and local inseparability of soul and body would, however, both question the belief in the immortality of the soul and—applied to Christology—demand, strictly speaking, the temporal and local coincidence of both natures.⁶²⁰ Just as Maximus realized the difficulties in the analogy between the composite hypostasis of man and the composite hypostasis of Christ, John will have noticed that the human body cannot really be claimed to have gained its subsistence in the human soul.⁶²¹ Thus, it may have been the asymmetry of his insubistence-Christology⁶²² which finally led him to postulating a special meaning of ἐνυπόστατος not (like Maximus) for Christ's two natures, but for his human nature in particular. Let us see whether this can be verified from the other, 'Christological' group of passages dealing with our term.

Actually, this supposition seems immediately justified, as five of the six instances where our term is used in a Christological context connect it more or less immediately with the insubistence formula⁶²³ and four of them predicate the term only of the human nature:

⁶¹⁹ Cf. ab. at nn. 511f.

⁶²⁰ In *Dial. fus.* 67,25–30 (PTS 7, 139) there is an attempt of harmonizing both stances: One can either perceive both natures together in the unique hypostasis (symmetric coexistence) or assume that the human nature receives its subsistence in the hypostasis of the Logos (asymmetric inexistence). Cross would probably refer the former to the union *in facto esse* and the latter to the union *in fieri* (his whole "perichoresis"-article rests on this distinction nowhere explicitly to be found in John's works; cf. esp. 71–73,120). Nevertheless, Cross also acknowledges John's ambiguous stance towards the anthropological paradigm (ibid., 105).

⁶²¹ Yet, he compares the Logos-hypostasis to the male sperm cf. bel. nn. 661–667.

⁶²² Cf. Rozemond, *Christologie*, chap. II ("Christologie asymétrique"). The asymmetric character of John's Christology is also stressed in the most recent summary account by A. Louth, *St. John Damascene: tradition and originality in Byzantine theology*, Oxford 2002, 144–178, though Louth (ibid., 160f.) is unwilling to recognize a concept of 'enhypostasia' as worked out above in John's works.

⁶²³ One could discuss, whether also *Volunt.* 9,8–10 (PTS 22, 191) has to be included into this list, because this text clearly substitutes the term ἐνυπόστατος by the insubistence formula: φύσιν προσλαβών, οὐχ ὑπόστασιν, φύσιν οὐκ ἀνυπόστατον, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ ὑποστάσαν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐσχηκυῖαν ὑπόστασιν.

For the flesh of the God Logos did not subsist independently nor did it become another hypostasis apart from that of the God Logos, but it was rather—because of subsisting in the latter—ἐνυπόστατος and not an independent hypostasis of its own.⁶²⁴

Being an ἐνούσιος hypostasis the Logos assumed an ἐνυπόστατος nature as first-fruit of our mass [Rom 11:16]. We call it ἐνυπόστατος, neither because it existed independently nor because it had a hypostasis of its own, but as having come to exist in the hypostasis of the Logos. For simultaneous is the flesh, simultaneous the flesh of the God Logos ...⁶²⁵

Being one hypostasis of the hypostases of the godhead, Christ had in himself the whole, undiminished nature of the godhead and assumed from the holy virgin an ἐνυπόστατον flesh, not as a hypostasis, but as subsisting in him, the first-fruit of our mass.⁶²⁶

Two other passages, however, connect the attribution of our term to both natures with the insubsistence of Christ's human nature in the Logos:

And in the case of the ineffable and incomprehensible dispensation of the Lord we call the hypostasis ἐνούσιον because it belongs to the substances it is composed of, and each of his substances ἐνυπόστατον; for they have his unique hypostasis in common—his godhead eternally, just as it also has the hypostasis of the Father and the Spirit, but his ensouled and reasonable flesh (one can also say: his manhood) as having received subsistence in it and having inherited it as hypostasis just recently.⁶²⁷

⁶²⁴ *Expos.* 53,14–17 (PTS 12, 128): Οὐ γὰρ ἰδιοσυστάτως ὑπέστη ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ οὐδὲ ἐτέρα ὑπόστασις γέγονε παρὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ὑπόστασιν, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ ὑποστάσῃ ἐνυπόστατος μάλλον καὶ οὐ καθ' αὐτὴν ἰδιοσύστατος ὑπόστασις γέγονε.

⁶²⁵ *Ctr. Jac.* 79,10–12 (PTS 22, 179): Ὑπόστασις γὰρ ὑπάρχων ἐνούσιος φύσιν ἀνέλαβεν ἐνυπόστατον ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου φυράματος. Ἐνυπόστατον δὲ φαμεν, οὐχ ὡς ἰδιοσυστάτως ὑπάρξασαν οὐδ' ὡς ἰδίαν ἐσχηκυῖαν ὑπόστασιν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοῦ λόγου ὑποστάσει ὑπάρξασαν. Ἄμα γὰρ σὰρξ, ἄμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ ... The passage from the letter to Jovianus is also quoted in *Expos.* 46,31–33 (PTS 12, 110) = *Hom. in Nativ.* 2,27 f. (PTS 29, 326).

⁶²⁶ *Ctr. Nest.* 2,14–18 (PTS 22, 265): ὁ Χριστὸς ὑπόστασις ὧν μία τῶν τῆς θεότητος ὑποστάσεων πᾶσαν τε τὴν τῆς θεότητος φύσιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχων ἀνελλιπῇ, προσελάβετο ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου σάρκα ἐνυπόστατον, οὐχ ὑπόστασιν, ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ μάλλον ὑποστάσαν, ἀπαρχὴν τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως. The fourth passage referring our term exclusively to Christ's human nature and the only one without connection to the insubsistence formula is *Ctr. Jac.* 53,8–11 (PTS 22, 128).

⁶²⁷ *Ctr. Jac.* 12,6–13 (PTS 22, 115): Καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου καὶ πάντα νοῦν ὑπερκειμένης τοῦ κυρίου οἰκονομίας ἐνούσιον μὲν φαμεν τὴν ὑπόστασιν ὡς ἐν ταῖς οὐσίαις τελοῦσαν, ἐξ ὧν καὶ συντέθεται, ἐνυπόστατον δὲ ἐκάστην τῶν οὐσιῶν αὐτοῦ. ἔχουσι γὰρ κοινὴν τὴν μίαν αὐτοῦ ὑπόστασιν ἡ μὲν θεότης αὐτοῦ αἰδίως, καθὰ καὶ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἡ δὲ ἐμψυχος καὶ λογικὴ αὐτοῦ σὰρξ, ταῦτ' ὅν' εἰπεῖν ἡ ἀνθρωπότης αὐτοῦ, προσφάτως ἐν αὐτῇ ὑποστάσῃ καὶ αὐτὴν κληρωσαμένη ὑπόστασιν.

Hence, both Christ's godhead and his manhood are ἐνυπόστατος; for both have his unique composite hypostasis in common—the godhead before all eons and eternally, the ensouled and intelligent flesh as assumed by the former in the last times, having received existence in it and having it as his hypostasis.⁶²⁸

When we examine those passages more closely, it appears that despite applying our term to both natures they still maintain a clear difference in its application: As having the same hypostasis, both natures are ἐνυπόστατος in the same sense. However, as to the specific origin of this hypostatic reality, the two natures clearly differ, one of them subsisting eternally in the second trinitarian hypostasis, the other gaining its subsistence only in the last days, being created and assumed by the Logos.⁶²⁹ Hence, John finally arrives both at defining a special meaning of ἐνυπόστατος as applied to Christ's human nature and at describing this meaning as (temporal) insubsistence in the divine Logos, who realizes his divine nature as well, but for all eternity. Thus, he integrates the Leontian (i.e. strictly Chalcedonian) 'distinction'-tradition into the Neochalcedonian insubsistence-Christology by emphasizing the extraordinary character of Christ's hypostatical realization: In general, an 'enhypostatic' nature is of course in no respect like an accident, yet in the case of Christ, the unquestionable preexistence of his divine hypostasis necessarily entails a preponderance of the divine nature realized in it versus the human one, which came to subsist in it only much later. However, as the chapters *Ctr. Aceph.* 6 and *Ctr. Jac.* 11f. also show traces of the 'twofold use', we have to compare the rapport between the two traditions in those chapters with that in *Dial. fus.* 45 before we examine John's use of the insubsistence formula in detail.

Surprisingly, *Ctr. Aceph.* 6 provides a harmonizing-effort independent from that in the Dialectics. Arguing for the distinction between hypostasis and ἐνυπόστατον, John points to the twofold use of both terms and explains it exactly like John the Grammarian⁶³⁰ and the *De sectis*⁶³¹ in the case of 'hypostasis', yet in a totally different manner in the case of ἐνυπόστατος:

⁶²⁸ *Ctr. Aceph.* 6,11–15 (PTS 22, 414): Καὶ ἡ θεότης τοίνυν καὶ ἡ ἀνθρωπότης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνυπόστατος ἐστίν· ἔχει γὰρ ἑκατέρα κοινὴν τὴν μίαν σύνθετον αὐτοῦ ὑπόστασιν, ἡ μὲν θεότης προαιωνίως καὶ αἰδίως, ἡ δὲ ἔμψυχος σὰρξ καὶ νοερά ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων ὑπ' αὐτῆς προσληφθεῖσα καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ὑπάρξασα καὶ αὐτὴν ἐσχηκυῖα ὑπόστασιν.

⁶²⁹ This is why I interpreted the *Aorist*-forms of ὑπάρχειν and ὑφίστασθαι in my translations as *aorista ingressiva*.

⁶³⁰ Cf. ab. n. 152.

⁶³¹ Cf. ab. n. 400.

We say that the substance is perceived in hypostases; and therefore it is also ἐνυπόστατος, but not a hypostasis. Thus, it is not necessary to call the ἐνυπόστατον a hypostasis, as both 'hypostasis' and 'ἐνυπόστατον' is spoken of in a twofold manner: For 'hypostasis' sometimes signifies just any reality whatsoever, according to which meaning it denotes not only any kind of substance, but also the accident, and sometimes it signifies the individual or the person, which is called per se 'hypostasis' and which refers to Peter, Paul, this horse and such things. ἐνυπόστατον sometimes signifies the substance as perceived in a hypostasis and being selfsubsisting, but sometimes also everything which comes together to compose a hypostasis, as in the case of soul and body.⁶³²

Basically, this is a substitution of Maximus' two kinds for the traditional twofold use, but with crucial adaptive alterations: The species in its individuals is replaced by the—as such selfsubsisting (αὐθύπαρκτος)—substance in its hypostasis (singular!), which amounts of course more or less to the narrower use of 'hypostasis', i.e. "individual or person" (6,6), with the only difference that speaking of an ἐνυπόστατον it is the substance we perceive as hypostatically realized, not simply the hypostasis. How Maximus' second kind is approximated to the traditional wider use is more difficult to see, especially considering the adduction of the soul-body-example known from *Dial. fus.* 45: John seems to refer the phrase ἕκαστον τῶν εἰς σύνθεσιν μίᾳς ὑποστάσεως συνερχομένων to the Cappadocian definition of 'hypostasis' as substance with properties, thus meaning by ἕκαστον both substantial (like soul and body) and accidental elements. This fusion of the different traditions appears, however, rather crude in comparison with the differentiated digest of *Dial. fus.* 45 and thus most probably pertains to an earlier stage in John's thought: He is already aware of the fact that only the 'distinction'-tradition can avoid the consequence of having at least in some sense to admit two hypostases in Christ, but has not yet quite figured out the difference between Maximus' and the traditional two meanings of our term, thus conflating the two natures concurring in the composite hypostasis with its two sets of traits, substantial and accidental ones.

⁶³² *Ctr. Aceph.* 6,1–11 (PTS 22, 414): Φαμέν οὖν, ὅτι ἐν ὑποστάσει μὲν ἡ οὐσία θεωρεῖται, διὸ καὶ ἐνυπόστατός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑπόστασις. Οὐκ ἀνάγκη τοίνυν τὸ ἐνυπόστατον ὑπόστασιν λέγεσθαι. Διτῶς γὰρ ἢ τε ὑπόστασις καὶ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον λέγεται. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὑπόστασις ποτὲ μὲν τὴν ἀπλῶς ὑπαρξίν δηλοῖ, καθὼς σημαινόμενον οὐ τὴν ἀπλῶς οὐσίαν σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ συμβεβηκός, ποτὲ δὲ τὸ ἄτομον ἦται τοῦ πρόσωπον, ἥτις καθ' αὐτὸ λέγεται ὑπόστασις, ἥτις δηλοῖ Πέτρον, Παῦλον, τόνδε τὸν ἵππον καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. Τὸ δὲ ἐνυπόστατον ποτὲ μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν σημαίνει ὡς ἐν ὑποστάσει θεωρουμένην καὶ αὐθύπαρκτον οὖσαν, ποτὲ δὲ ἕκαστον τῶν εἰς σύνθεσιν μίᾳς ὑποστάσεως συνερχομένων, ὡς ἐπὶ ψυχῆς ἔχει καὶ σώματος.

This result is confirmed by the fact that in the more elaborated *Ctr. Jac.* 11 f. there is only a very small trace of the ‘twofold use’-tradition left,⁶³³ whereas the struggle for elucidating Leontius’ distinction between ‘hypostasis’ and ἐνυπόστατον dominates the entire paragraph. In a way strongly reminiscent of Pamphilus,⁶³⁴ *Ctr. Jac.* 11 is trying very hard to clarify the difficult terminological technicalities of the famous CNE passage:

For οὐσία and ἐνούσιον is not identical, nor ἐνυπόστατον and ‘hypostasis’, as what is in something is different from that in which it is: ἐνούσιον is what is perceived in the οὐσία, i.e. the bundle of accidents which marks the hypostasis, not the οὐσία itself. ἐνυπόστατον is not the hypostasis, but what is perceived in a hypostasis, i.e. the οὐσία—yet in whatever way it may subsist, be it by itself, be it together with something else or be it in something else: by itself like the substance of fire, together with something else like soul and body (for those have their hypostasis together with each other), in something else like fire in the torch or like the flesh of the Lord in his beginningless hypostasis.

For ‘hypostasis’ signifies a concrete person or individual entity, which can be shown by pointing with the finger, but the ἐνυπόστατον signifies the οὐσία. And the hypostasis determines a person by his or her characteristic properties, but ἐνυπόστατον makes clear that what has its subsistence in something else is not an accident.

If what is in something is not different from that in which it is, watch yourself calling virtue identical with the virtuous (ἐνάρετον) and according to the logical inversion also evil with that in which it is. Hence, according to you, the devil will be evil itself and his creator the creator of evil, and, as the accident is in the substance, the accident will be substance and vice versa, or, as the body is en-souled, the human one I mean, according to you the body will be soul.⁶³⁵

⁶³³ In the threefold use of οὐσία (11,12–13) in the sense of selfsubsisting entity, substantial element and insubsisting (accidental) element (cf. bel. n. 637). Similarly, in *Ctr. Jac.* 8 (PTS 22, 113) the twofold use of ‘hypostasis’ just appears as a learned gloss without any relevance for the argumentation.

⁶³⁴ Cf. ab. after n. 365.

⁶³⁵ *Ctr. Jac.* 11,3–22 (PTS 22,114): ἀλλ’ οὐ ταὐτὸν οὐσία τε καὶ ὑπόστασις οὐδὲ φύσις καὶ πρόσωπον. Οὐ γάρ ταὐτὸν οὐσία τε καὶ ἐνούσιον οὐδ’ ἐνυπόστατον καὶ ὑπόστασις. Ἐτερον γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν τινι καὶ ἕτερον τὸ ἐν ᾧ· ἐνούσιον μὲν γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ θεωρούμενον, τουτέστι τὸ τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἄθροισμα, ὃ δηλοῖ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν οὐσίαν. Ἐνυπόστατον δὲ οὐχ ἡ ὑπόστασις, τὸ ἐν ὑποστάσει δὲ καθορώμενον. Οὐσία δέ, τουτέστιν ὅπως οὖν ὑπάρχει, εἴτε καθ’ ἑαυτὴν εἴτε σὺν ἐτέρῳ εἴτε ἐν ἐτέρῳ· καθ’ αὐτὴν μὲν ὡς πυρὸς οὐσία, σὺν ἐτέροις δὲ ὡς ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα (σὺν ἁλλήλοις γάρ ταῦτα τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔχει), ἐν ἐτέρῳ δὲ ὡς πῦρ ἐν θρυαλλίδι καὶ ὡς ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τῇ ἀνάρχῳ αὐτοῦ ὑποστάσει. Ἡ μὲν γάρ ὑπόστασις τὸν τινὰ ἢ τὸδε δηλοῖ τὸ ἅμα τῇ τοῦ δακτύλου ἀνατάσει δεικνύμενον, τὸ δὲ ἐνυπόστατον τὴν οὐσίαν. Καὶ ἡ μὲν ὑπόστασις πρόσωπον ὀρίζει τοῖς χαρακτηριστικοῖς ιδιώμασιν, τὸ δὲ γε ἐνυπόστατον τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸ συμβεβηκός, ὃ ἐν ἐτέρῳ ἔχει τὴν ὑπαρξιν. Εἰ γὰρ ταῦτὸ τὸ ἐν τινι καὶ τὸ ἐν ᾧ, ὥρα σοι λέγειν ταὐτὸν ἀρετὴν καὶ ἐνάρετον καὶ

As this passage—in contrast to the one in Pamphilus—seems to draw exclusively on the first lines of the famous Leontius-text (MSG 86/I, 1277C13–D6), John's direct dependence on Leontius might well be questioned. Yet, as *Ctr. Jac.* 11,11f. adduces the torch example from a passage later in CNE (1304B/C), it appears more plausible to me that unlike Pamphilus John just omitted all the technicalities he regarded as unnecessary for establishing the crucial point: Ἐτερον γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν τινι καὶ ἕτερον τὸ ἐν ᾧ (11,5). This point was in John's view apparently rather obfuscated by Leontius complex arguments, as the latter does not even give a single hint concerning the difference between οὐσία and ἐνούσιον and presents the one between 'hypostasis' and ἐνυπόστατον only in a very indirect and complicated manner. Thus, John first of all feels the need of explaining the former difference in order to shed light on the latter: Following the tradition we encountered already in Anastasius Sinaïtes,⁶³⁶ he opposes the substance itself to the ἐν-οὐσία, i.e. the individuating properties *in* the substance, and infers an analogous opposition between the hypostasis itself and the ἐνυπόστατα, i.e. the substances. That those can actually be said to subsist in the hypostases just as the individuating properties are said to subsist in the substance, is established by referring to a threefold mode of subsistence, which occurs already in the antitrithemist dialogue of Anastasius I. of Antioch:⁶³⁷ A substance can either be individualized by itself, like the element fire (the example probably derived from Leontius' torch), together with another substance, like soul and body, or in something else, like fire in a torch or Christ's flesh in the divine hypostasis. Why John introduces exactly this distinction here, is not easy to see. The first mode might even be said to question the difference between the hypostasis and the substance in the hypostasis, as the former apparently also subsists completely by itself. The reason might become clear when we recall our analysis of *Dial. fus.* 45, as the first two modes in *Ctr. Jac.* 11 fairly exactly correspond with the two proper meanings of the term there, the self-subsisting substance understood as a species inherent in its individuals, and the third obviously matches the additional, Christological use,

κατὰ τὴν εὐλογον ἀντιστροφὴν κακίαν καὶ τὸ ἐν ᾧ ἢ κακία, καὶ ἔσται κατὰ σέ αὐτὸς ὁ διάβολος κακία καὶ ὁ τοῦτου δημιουργὸς κακίας δημιουργός, καί, ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ τὸ συμβεβηκός, ἔσται τὸ συμβεβηκός οὐσία καὶ συμβεβηκός ἡ οὐσία, ἢ ἐπειδὴ ἐμψυχον τὸ σῶμα, φημί τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἔσται κατὰ σέ τὸ σῶμα ψυχή.

⁶³⁶ Cf. ab. before n. 588.

⁶³⁷ Uthemann, "Streitgespräch", 103; ll. 780f.: Φύσις μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνυπόστατος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴη φύσις· πᾶν γὰρ ὑπάρχον, εἴτε καθ' ἑαυτὸ εἴτε σὺν ἑτέρῳ ἢ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν, ἐνυπόστατόν ἐστιν. This parallel was discovered by Lang, "Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos", 652. For a further contextualization of the passage cf. ab. nn. 410–412.

which is also set apart from the second, anthropological use or mode on the grounds of the preexistence of the divine element in *Ctr. Jac.* 11,12 (cf. 12,10–13).

In the remaining two paragraphs, John at first aims at demonstrating the functional difference between the terms ‘hypostasis’ and ἐνυπόστατος in a paraphrase of CNE 1277D1–6 (11,12–16) and then adds a further illustration of his own (11,16–23). Probably in the light of CNE 1280A,⁶³⁸ he makes a positive and a negative statement about the function⁶³⁹ and reference of both terms: Whereas ‘hypostasis’—like a name—refers to a concrete individual and singles it out on the grounds of its characteristic properties, ἐνυπόστατος refers to an essence and makes clear that its hypostatical realization in something else is not that of an accident.

This elucidation of the mode of in-being we are dealing with here is unfortunately obfuscated again by the subsequent illustration, which adduces the parallels of a qualified entity existing ‘in’ its quality, a body existing ‘in’ its soul and finally the accident existing in its substance. Nevertheless, those parallels are extremely revealing concerning our introductory question, to which one of the two relevant types of ἐν-adjectives our term belongs: In the case of both examples (ἔμψυχος, ἐνάρετος), the prefix ἐν- originally meant nothing but the opposite of an α-privativum.⁶⁴⁰ Yet, this obviously does not prevent John from interpreting this simple possession of a feature or quality as participation or inexistence in an entity. Thus, he comes at least very close to a Loofsian reading of our term. As this problem is, however, of capital importance for the entire task of this study, we will save its further examination for the concluding reflections.

4.3.2. *The Exact Meaning of the Insubsistence Formula*

Although we have already mentioned the close connection between our term and the insubsistence formula in John, we still have to examine his use of this formula more intensively in order to reveal all the systematic implications of this connection. John uses ‘subsist in’ numerous times and

⁶³⁸ Cf. ab. after n. 192.

⁶³⁹ This is how I would interpret his amplification of Leontius’ τὸν τινὰ δηλοῖ τοὺς τινὰ ἢ τότε δηλοῖ τὸ ἅμα τῇ τοῦ δακτύλου ἀνατάσει δεικνύμενον (*Ctr. Jac.* 11,13f.): as a resumption of Leontius’ claim that ‘hypostasis’ singles out the individual from the general, whereas οὐσία resp. ἐνυπόστατον reveals the character of a general entity (CNE; MSG 86/I, 1280A8–10).

⁶⁴⁰ This is obvious in the case of ἔμψυχος/ἐμψυχος. In the case of ἐνάρετος, we only have rare, late references for an ἀναρετής.

almost exclusively⁶⁴¹ to describe the relationships between accident and substance⁶⁴² or (in the majority of instances) flesh and Logos-hypostasis. Only five times does the formula refer to the relation between substance and hypostasis in general.⁶⁴³ As to the Christological application, three grammatical variants have to be distinguished: The verb ὑφίστημι either occurs in the active voice,⁶⁴⁴ i.e. the Logos is said to have ‘caused’ the human nature ‘to subsist’ in him, or in the transitive middle,⁶⁴⁵ i.e. the Logos ‘causes’ the human nature ‘to subsist for himself’, or—the traditional variant—in the intransitive middle,⁶⁴⁶ i.e. the human nature is simply said to subsist in the Logos. Rozemond’s claim of the fundamental significance of “la notion d’enhypostasie” holds true at least with regard to John’s frequent and emphatic use of the insubistence formula. If we look for alternative formulas, the first candidate is of course Maximus’ coexistence formula. The two instances from the *Expositio* alluding to the Leontio-Maximian phrase μετὰ τῆς συγχειμένης καὶ συνυφেষτηκυίας are dealing with the consequences of the union for the natures, namely the communicatio idiomatum and the triad ‘deification’—‘incarnation’—‘communion’ reflecting Cyril of

⁶⁴¹ Two antimanichean passages deny the ‘inexistence’ of the latter’s alleged two principles in each other (*Expos.* 93,4; PTS 12, 220) and maintain the ‘inexistence’ of τὸ εἶναι in τὸ ὄν in order to make sure that those two do not constitute a manichean duality (*Ctr. Man.* 16,23 f.; PTS 22, 361).

⁶⁴² *Dial. fus.* 9,40 (PTS 7, 73); 17,4 f. (Ibid., 86); 30,10 f. (p. 93); 40,7 f. (p. 106); 42,17 f. (pp. 107 f.) / *Ctr. Aceph.* 8,7 (PTS 22, 415). More frequently, he uses τὴν ὑπαρξιν or τὸ εἶναι ἔχειν ἐν: *Dial. fus.* 4,10.66 f. (PTS 7, 58 f.); 10,103 f.119 f. (p. 77); 17,4 (p. 86); 40,4–6 (p. 106); 46,4 (p. 110); 48,5,13 f. (p. 112) / *Ctr. Man.* 31,4 f. (PTS 22, 369) / *Ctr. Jac.* 8,3 (PTS 22, 113).

⁶⁴³ *Dial. fus.* 31,16–19 (PTS 7; 94); 43,22 f. (Ibid., 109); 45,7 f. (p. 110) / *Expos.* 50,12 f. (PTS 12,120); 55,4 f. (Ibid., 131).

⁶⁴⁴ *Expos.* 56,13,33 f. (PTS 12, 134 f.) / *Ctr. Nest.* 2,4 f. (PTS 22, 264) / *Hom. in Dorm.* I 3,26 f. (PTS 29, 486).

⁶⁴⁵ *Expos.* 51,9 f. (PTS 12, 123); 86,99 (Ibid., 195) / *De fide ctr. Nest.* 23,3 f. (PTS 22, 244) / *Ctr. Nest.* 43,27 (PTS 22, 286) / *Ctr. Aceph.* 9,21 f. (PTS 22, 416) / *Hom. in Nativ.* 2,24–26 (PTS 29, 326) = *Expos.* 46,28–20 (PTS 12, 110).

⁶⁴⁶ *Dial. fus.* 45,20 f. (PTS 7, 110); 67,27,29 (Ibid., 139) / *Expos.* 53,15 f. (PTS 12, 128) / *De fide ctr. Nest.* 23,5,14 (PTS 22, 244) / *Ctr. Nest.* 1,34 (PTS 22, 264); 2,17 f. (Ibid., 265) / *Ctr. Jac.* 12,12 f. (PTS 22, 115) / *Hom. in sab.* 29,36 f. (PTS 29, 139) / *Hom. in Dorm.* I 8,38 f. (PTS 29, 493). Synonymously to ὑφίστημι in the intransitive middle John can use the verbs ὑπάργχειν ἐν (*Expos.* 61,29 f. [PTS 12, 156]; 66,13 f. [p. 165] / *De fide ctr. Nest.* 23,5 [PTS 22, 244] / *Ctr. Aceph.* 6,15 [PTS 22, 414] / *Ctr. Jac.* 11,12 [PTS 22, 114]; 79,13 f. [Ibid., 136]), ὑπόστασιν or ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν ἐν (*Dial. fus.* 45,18 [PTS 7, 110] / *Expos.* 56,70 [PTS 12, 136] = *Ctr. Jac.* 83,22 f. (PTS 22, 141) / *Expos.* 71,21 f. [p. 170]), the Leontian ἐνυφίστασθαι (*Hom. in Dorm.* II 14,11; PTS 29, 531) or the Maximian and Theodorian (ab. n. 370 and 544 f.) τὸ εἶναι λαγχάνειν (Maximus said λαμβάνειν) ἐν (*Expos.* 46,37; PTS 12, 110 / *Hom. in Nativ.* 2,32 f.; PTS 29, 327).

Alexandria's threefold *divisio vocum*.⁶⁴⁷ As there are two similar instances in John's other works in contexts treating the same topic,⁶⁴⁸ he will have regarded the formula as describing the consequences of the union rather than the union itself, which, for him, would be more aptly depicted by the insubistence formula. However, a proper alternative expression to the latter is John's identification of the Logos as the hypostasis of the flesh, an asymmetric echo of Maximus' 'more immediate' connection between *both* natures and their hypostasis.⁶⁴⁹ As John attaches this identification very frequently to the insubistence formula, he probably considers it to be some kind of precision or completion of the latter: The flesh is said to subsist in the Logos with "having (got)",⁶⁵⁰ "possessing"⁶⁵¹ or "getting allotted"⁶⁵² the latter as his hypostasis or with the latter "having become"⁶⁵³ or "bearing the title of"⁶⁵⁴ the former's hypostasis.

Why John identifies the Logos with the hypostasis of the flesh so straightforwardly and emphatically, will become clear in examining a little closer how this insubistence-concept is rooted in John's idea of hypostasis and hypostatic union. As we have immediately noticed in quoting a few of John's

⁶⁴⁷ *Expos.* 48,32f. (PTS 12, 117) / 91,51–53 (*Ibid.*, 214). The relevant Cyril-passages are collected by Uthemann, "Vorbereitung", 379 f. n. 31.

⁶⁴⁸ *Ctr. Jac.* 81,34–36 (PTS 22, 139: *communicatio idiomatum*) / *Volunt.* 42,30–33 (PTS 22, 228: three modes of the union, i.e. divine, human, theandric [cf. ab. n. 567]). The last instance, *Ctr. Jac.* 79,21–23 (PTS 22, 137), uses the formula to stress the remaining duality of natures.

⁶⁴⁹ Cf. ab. n. 549.

⁶⁵⁰ *Dial. fus.* 45,20f. (PTS 7, 110): ἐν γὰρ τῇ ὑποστάσει τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ὑπέστη προσληφθεῖσα ὑπ' αὐτῆς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ἔσχε καὶ ἔχει ὑπόστασιν; 67,29 (*Ibid.*, 139): ἐν τῇ προϋπαρχούσῃ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ὑποστάσει ὑπέστη προσληφθεῖσα ὑπ' αὐτῆς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ἔσχε καὶ ἔχει ὑπόστασιν / *Ctr. Aceph.* 6,15f. (PTS 22, 414): ἐν αὐτῇ ὑπάρξασα καὶ αὐτὴν ἐσχηκυῖα ὑπόστασιν. For the occurrence of those 'identification'-formulas without connection to the insubistence formula cf. Kotter's apparatus on *Expos.* 51,15 (PTS 12, 123) and *De fide ctr. Nest.* 29,6 (PTS 22, 247).

⁶⁵¹ *Hom. in sab.* 29,36–38 (PTS 29, 139): ἐν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ὑποστάσει ὑφισταμένης τῆς τε ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ μετὰ θάνατον καὶ ταύτην κεκτημένων ὑπόστασιν.

⁶⁵² *Ctr. Jac.* 12,12f. (PTS 22, 115): ἐν αὐτῇ ὑποστάσει καὶ αὐτὴν κληρωσαμένη ὑπόστασιν.

⁶⁵³ *Expos.* 55,12–15 (PTS 12, 131): οὐ καθ' αὐτὴν ὑποστάσαν καὶ ἄτομον χρηματίσασαν πρότερον καὶ οὕτως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προσληφθεῖσαν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ὑποστάσει ὑπάρξασαν. Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἢ ὑπόστασις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο τῇ σαρκὶ ὑπόστασις; 56,33f. (*Ibid.*, 135): ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει αὐτοῦ ἐψυχωμένην σάρκα ψυχῇ λογικῇ τε καὶ νοερᾷ ὑποστήσας, αὐτὸς γεγονώς αὐτῇ ὑπόστασις / *Hom. in Nativ.* 2,24–27 (PTS 29, 326) = *Expos.* 46,28–31 (PTS 12, 110): ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ὑποστάσει ἐκ τῶν ἀνρῶν τῆς παρθένου αἱμάτων σάρκα ἐψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ τε καὶ νοερᾷ ὑπεστήσατο ἀπαρχὴν προσλαβόμενος τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου φυράματος, αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος γενόμενος τῇ σαρκὶ ὑπόστασις.

⁶⁵⁴ *Ctr. Nest.* 2,4f. (PTS 22, 264): ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ὑποστάσει ὑποστήσας καὶ χρηματίσας αὐτῇ ὑπόστασις / *Ctr. Aceph.* 9,21–23 (PTS 22, 416): ἐν ἑαυτῇ ὑπεστήσατο σάρκα ἐμψυχον λογικὴν, αὐτὴν χρηματίσασα τῇ ἐμψυχῷ καὶ λογικῇ σαρκὶ ὑπόστασις.

passages on insubistence, his concept of hypostasis very clearly displays an aspect the Cappadocian concept did originally comprise, but most of the time implicitly: the constitution of a hypostasis by its beginning or origin, i.e. τρόπος ὑπάρξεως, in M. Richard's words "origine continuée", which we already encountered in dealing with the letter to Jovianus and its source, the fourth Pseudo-Athanasian dialogue on the trinity.⁶⁵⁵ John explicitly agrees with this interpretation when he says: "The hypostasis is the composition (σύμπηξις) into a thing in the beginning of the existence of each of it".⁶⁵⁶ Thus, we immediately understand the connection between the denial of a προδιάπλασις of the human nature and the latter's subsistence in the hypostasis of the Logos: "And again, it is impossible that what once subsisted by itself should receive another beginning of hypostasis; for hypostasis is (coming into) existence by itself".⁶⁵⁷ The connection to Maximus' resumption of the logos-tropos-distinction is made explicit in John's treatise on the two wills, when he explains how the creator composes individuals from substances and accidents:

Those elements are all substantial and natural, but their individually modelled and chosen movement (constitutes) the hypostatical difference. To participate in the former constitutes the identity of nature, but the way of (coming into) existence (τρόπος ὑπάρξεως) introduces the difference of hypostases, and the separated (coming into) existence and composition (σύμπηξις) of every single being and the individually modelled and moved and different use of the natural elements causes the hypostases to be marked off and enables us to speak of many human beings.⁶⁵⁸

⁶⁵⁵ Cf. ab. nn. 164–169.

⁶⁵⁶ ὑπόστασις γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐκάστου ὑπάρξεως κατ' αὐτὸ σύμπηξις. (*Dial. fus.* 67,21f.; PTS 7, 139). The κατ' αὐτό has to be referred back to ἕκαστον with κατά introducing the aim of the composition-process (Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v. B III; 883ab). Richter (*Die Philosophischen Kapitel des Johannes von Damaskus*, Stuttgart 1982, 154) translates: "Ein Einzelwesen ist ja die Zusammenfügung für sich am Anfang des Bestehens eines jeden", i.e. reads (following b) καθ' αὐτό instead, which in my opinion does not make much sense. The parallel in *Expos.* 71,21–24 (PTS 12, 170) claims that Christ's body and soul had their hypostasis κατὰ ταῦτόν in the Logos, i.e. simultaneously (cf. *Expos.* 13,30–38).

⁶⁵⁷ *Dial. fus.* 67,34–36 (PTS 7, 140): Καὶ πάλιν ἀδύνατον τὰ ἀπαξ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὑποστάντα ἐτέραν ἀρχὴν ὑποστάσεως σχεῖν· ἡ γὰρ ὑπόστασις ἡ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐστὶν ὑπαρξις. The ambivalence of the Greek ὑπαρξις ('existence' or 'beginning') can only be rendered in English very oddly.

⁶⁵⁸ *Volunt.* 7 col. 2,12–27 (PTS 22, 183f.): Ταῦτα πάντα οὐσιώδη εἰσὶ καὶ φυσικά, ἡ δὲ τούτων ιδιότροπος καὶ ἰδιαιρέτος κίνησις ὑποστατικὴ διαφορά. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ μετέχειν τούτων τὸ ταυτὸν τῆς φύσεως παρίστησιν, ὁ δὲ τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως τὴν τῶν ὑποστάσεων εἰσάγει διαφοράν, καὶ ἡ ἀποτετμημένη ἐκάστου ὑπαρξις τε καὶ σύμπηξις καὶ ἡ ιδιότροπος καὶ ιδιοκίνητος καὶ διάφορος τῶν φυσικῶν χρήσις ἀποτετμημένας τὰς ὑποστάσεις ποιεῖ καὶ πολλοὺς λέγεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

The notion of σύμμηξις—we talked about its Christological tradition when dealing with Maximus' use of it⁶⁵⁹—seems to fulfil a twofold function in this context: It links the logos-tropos-distinction with the Porphyrio-Cappadocian concept of an individual as ἄθροισμα ἰδιωμάτων, as it is the substantial and accidental properties which are “put together” in order to make up the individual,⁶⁶⁰ and it resumes the Maximian ‘biology’ of incarnation we have examined above:

In the case of every (normal) woman, the conception happens when a sperm is thrown down from a man, and the conception is the effect of the sperm; and the sperm is the hypostasis right in the moment of the conception, when the woman provides her own blood and both get combined, the blood settles down (ὑφίστασθαι) in the sperm and the sperm itself becomes a hypostasis for it, and the sperm becomes a common hypostasis for itself and the female blood. However, in the case of the holy virgin it was not so; for the conception was not from a male sperm, but [...] the son of God overshadowed her [...] like a divine sperm and composed (συνέπηξεν) for himself from her untainted and most pure blood a flesh ensouled by a rational and intelligent soul in becoming the hypostasis for the latter.⁶⁶¹

Just as in Maximus, the active and form-giving role of the sperm is transferred to the Logos—John is quite fond of Theodoretus' formula οἶονεῖ θεῖος σπóρος which he takes to be Justin's⁶⁶²—which makes a proper human sperm superfluous.⁶⁶³ However, the direct and explicit identification of sperm and hypostasis is astonishing. The treatise on the two wills explains this more carefully:

We will come to know that there is only one hypostasis of Christ the following way: The beginning of every child's existence and his hypostasis is the sperm thrown down from the father into the uterus of the woman in the con-

⁶⁵⁹ Cf. ab. at nn. 554–557.

⁶⁶⁰ Cf. also bel. n. 673.

⁶⁶¹ *Ctr. Nest.* 43,32–39,42–46 (PTS 22, 286 f.): 'Εφ' ἐκάστης γὰρ τῶν γυναικῶν σύλληψις γίνεται σποράς ἐξ ἀνδρὸς καταβαλλομένης, καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς σποράς ἐστὶν ἡ σύλληψις· καὶ ἡ σπορά ἐστὶν ἡ ὑπόστασις ἅμα τῇ συλλήψει χορηγούσης τῆς γυναικὸς τὰ οἰκεία αἵματα καὶ συναφείας γινομένης, καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς σπορᾷ ὑφισταμένων τῶν αἱμάτων, καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς σποράς γινομένης αὐτοῖς ὑποστάσεως καὶ κοινῆς ὑποστάσεως ἑαυτῇ καὶ τοῖς γυναικεῖοις αἵμασι τῆς σποράς γινομένης. 'Επὶ δὲ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου οὐχ οὕτως· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ σποράς ἀνδρὸς ἡ σύλληψις, ἀλλὰ [...] ἐπεσκίασεν ἐπ' αὐτὴν [...] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ [...] καὶ συνέπηξεν ἑαυτῷ ἐκ τῶν ἀργύων καὶ καθαρῶτάων αὐτῆς αἱμάτων σάρκα ἐψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ τε καὶ νοερᾷ, αὐτὸς γεγωνῶς αὐτῇ ὑπόστασις.

⁶⁶² *Expos.* 46,21 (PTS 12, 109) = *Hom. in Nativ.* 2,17 (PTS 29, 326) / *Ctr. Jac.* 90,3 (PTS 22, 144; here the explicit quotation from Ps-Justin's *Expositio fidei*) / *Volunt.* 9,54 (PTS 22, 192) / *De fide ctr. Nest.* 23,2 (PTS 22, 244) / *Ctr. Nest.* 43,26 (PTS 22, 286).

⁶⁶³ Cf. *Expos.* 2,21 (PTS 12, 9); 51,8 f.35 (*Ibid.*, 123,125); 87,70 f. (p. 201) / *Haer.* 100,20 (PTS 22, 61) / *Hom. in Dorm.* I 9,9 (PTS 29, 494); I 12,14 (*ibid.*, 497); II 2,40 (p. 519).

ception of which the woman provides her own blood, and thus the child is constituted. There is one single hypostasis of the sperm and the blood from the mother, which has settled down in it in order to form (solid) flesh. The woman conceives from the intercourse with the man the sperm thrown down from him, and the latter is the hypostasis of the child.⁶⁶⁴

In its function as active and form-giving power in the conception, the sperm is ἀρχὴ ἢ αἰτία ὑπάρξεως of every animal transforming the undetermined mass of blood into the distinct and concrete flesh of a certain individual and can thus be regarded—according to the logos-tropos-conception—as the constitutive principle of every hypostasis, practically identical with it. The lack of human sperm is thus the necessary presupposition for the lack of a human hypostasis.⁶⁶⁵ John can thus interchangeably claim the sperm to assume a body or the Logos to cause the virgin's pure blood to subsist for himself as his flesh without a sperm.⁶⁶⁶ Moreover, he underscores this concept of hypostasis by a 'biological' etymology of the term, in that he connects it with the 'settling down' (ὑφίστασθαι) or curdling of Mary's menstrual blood (to flesh) in the logos-seed.⁶⁶⁷ Although John never explicitly draws upon the milk-analogy or quotes Job 10:10 or Sap 7:1 f. in the relevant contexts, the biology of propagation behind those texts must have been so widespread that John could intersperse such learned plays on words without the risk of being misunderstood.

Despite expounding the incarnation in a more technical and detailed manner than Maximus, John seems to take the latter's solutions⁶⁶⁸ to our two

⁶⁶⁴ *Volunt.* 9,39–48 (PTS 22, 192): "Ὅτι μία τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπόστασις, ἐντεῦθεν γνωσόμεθα. Ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐκάστου βρέφους ὑπάρξεως καὶ ὑπόστασις ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκ πατρὸς καταβαλλομένη σπορά ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ τῆς γυναικός, ἣν συλλαμβάνουσα ἡ γυνὴ χορηγεῖ τὰ οἰκεία αἵματα, καὶ οὕτως συνίσταται τὸ βρέφος. Μία ὑπόστασις τῆς σπορᾶς καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς ἐν αὐτῇ ὑφισταμένων εἰς σάρκα αἱμάτων, καὶ ἡ σύλληψις τῆς σπορᾶς ἐστὶ. Συλλαμβάνει δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μίξεως τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ καταβαλλόμενον σπέρμα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ βρέφους ὑπόστασις.

⁶⁶⁵ Cf. *De fide ctr. Nest.* 23,6–9,12–15 (PTS 22, 244): οὐδὲ ἔσχε σποράν ἢ ἄλλο τι ὑπόστασιν εἰ μὴ τὸν θεὸν μόνον. παντὸς γὰρ βρέφους ὑπόστασις σπορά, ταύτης δὲ ὁ θεὸς λόγος. Καὶ πάντα σὰρξ τινὸς γίνεται, αὕτη δὲ οὐδὲ ἐνὸς εἰ μὴ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου. Διὰ τοῦτο μία ὑπόστασις. Οὕτω νοοῦμεν τὸ "ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο", [...] ὅτι οὕτε ἀρχὴν ἢ αἰτίαν ὑπάρξεως ἔσχεν ἡ σὰρξ ἐκείνη ἢ ἀγία εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ οὔτε ἄλλου ἐγένετο εἰ μὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπέστη καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν ἡ ἔνωσις τῶν φύσεων.

⁶⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 29,9–14 (p. 247) cf. *Expos.* 86,66–68 (PTS 12, 193).

⁶⁶⁷ *Volunt.* 9,44–46 (PTS 22, 192): Μία ὑπόστασις τῆς σπορᾶς καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς ἐν αὐτῇ ὑφισταμένων εἰς σάρκα αἱμάτων / *Ctr. Nest.* 43,35 f. (PTS 22, 286): ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς σπορᾷ ὑφισταμένων τῶν αἱμάτων. Cf. ab. n. 554 on Maximus. C. Chevalier's translation and interpretation of *Ctr. Nest.* 43,35 f. (*La Mariologie de St. Jean Damascène*, Rome 1936 [OrChrA 109], 110: "Le coit s'accomplit et donne personnalité au sang dans la semence virile") follows a *varia lectio* of LPW, which is yet unsustainable for grammatical reasons.

⁶⁶⁸ Cf. ab. nn. 562–564.

systematical problems of the Neochalcedonian insubsistence-Christology⁶⁶⁹ more or less for granted. Regarding the second problem of how the identical character of the second trinitarian hypostasis can be sustained despite the addition of human properties in the incarnation, he repeats Maximus' claim that the son-like mode of origin/existence revealed both in the trinitarian generation and the virgin-birth of the Logos constitutes the "unalterable idiom" of the second person on different occasions.⁶⁷⁰ He merely adds one further precision: As this son-like mode of existence is that of the first and only-born son, Christ's hypostasis is incapable of reproduction and intercourse with other members of the same species, which, however, does not contradict his real participation in this species, as there are also many human beings who do not reproduce.⁶⁷¹ Accordingly, we find John arguing on Leontio-Maximian lines⁶⁷² also as to the first problem, why the individually determined human nature cannot be called a hypostasis separate from the Logos:

He is thus one in hypostasis, identical with himself, marked off from the extremes by the characteristic properties. Even if his holy flesh was not bereft of the characteristic properties, their collection and the hypostasis and constitution of the flesh did not happen by itself, but in the hypostasis of the Logos, and it had the latter as its hypostasis, not a proper one. Therefore it was neither without hypostasis nor did it have a proper hypostasis, but [this hypostasis] subsists as two natures, united and separated by the consubstantiality with the extremes and the non-consubstantiality of the parts.⁶⁷³

⁶⁶⁹ Cf. ab. nn. 413–415.

⁶⁷⁰ *Expos.* 77,1–4 (PTS 12, 174); *Ctr. Jac.* 52,55–58 (PTS 22, 127); 79,4–10 (*ibid.*, 136); *Volunt.* 37 (*ibid.*, 222).

⁶⁷¹ *Volunt.* 37 (PTS 22, 222): Τὸ δὲ σπερματικὸν καὶ γεννητικὸν οὐκ ἔσχεν· ἀμετάπτωτα γὰρ τῶν θείων ὑποστάσεων τὰ ἰδιώματα, καὶ ἀδύνατον τὸν πατέρα ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα γενέσθαι υἱόν. Διὸ οὐδὲ γέγονεν υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα μείνῃ ἀμετάβλητον τὸ ἰδίωμα. Ἐπειτα ὑπόστασις ὁμοφυεῖ ὑποστάσει μίγνυται. Οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ἄλλη τοιαύτη ὑπόστασις υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου· εἷς γὰρ μονογενὴς υἱός, μόνος ἐκ μόνου πατὴρ καὶ μόνος ἐκ μόνης μητρός, υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἔτι δὲ εἰ καὶ φυσικὴ ἢ μίξις διὰ τὸν πληθυσμὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀναγκαία· δυνατόν γὰρ ἄνθρωπον ζῆν καὶ εἶναι ἄνθρωπον μὴ μίγνύμενον, καὶ πολλοὶ γεγόνاسι τούτου τοῦ πάθους ἀπηλλαγμένοι. Cf. Louth, *John Damascene*, 169f.

⁶⁷² Cf. ab. nn. 413 and 563.

⁶⁷³ *Ctr. Jac.* 80,12–17 (PTS 22, 137f.): Εἷς οὖν ἐστὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταυτιζόμενος, τῶν δ' ἄκρων τοῖς χαρακτηριστικοῖς ἀφοριζόμενος ἰδιώμασιν· εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῶν χαρακτηριστικῶν ἰδιωμάτων ἡ ἀγία αὐτοῦ σὰρξ οὐκ ἄμοιρος ἦν, ἀλλὰ γε τούτων τὸ ἄθροισμα καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡ ὑπόστασις τε καὶ σύμμηξις οὐ καθ' αὐτήν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοῦ λόγου ὑποστάσει γεγένηται καὶ αὐτήν, οὐκ ἰδίαν ἔσχεν ὑπόστασιν. Ἐντεῦθεν οὔτε ἀνυπόστατος ἦν οὔτε ἰδίαν ἔσχεν ὑπόστασιν, δύο δὲ φύσεις ὑπάρχει ὁμοουσιότητα μὲν τῶν ἄκρων, ἑτεροουσιότητα δὲ τῶν μερῶν ἐνούμενός τε καὶ διαιρούμενος.

As Christ's hypostasis is thus constituted by the ἄθροισμα and σύμψηξις of the two sets of characteristic properties in the Logos, i.e. by the origin and mode of existence of Christ qua individual, the characteristic properties of the flesh cannot separate it from the Logos, but rather unite the two natural elements in displaying their individuality as distinguished from any other member of the two respective species. Accidental properties like nose-shape or hair-colour would, as John expounds further in the first two paragraphs of the treatise on the two wills, only mark off individuals of the same species from each other, because individuals of different species are to be distinguished a fortiori by their natural properties. Thus, both the natural and hypostatical idioms of the divine and human nature are to be regarded as constitutive of the Christological hypostasis rather than as hypostatically distinguishing its two elements from each other.⁶⁷⁴

To conclude, we cannot affirm Studer's harsh judgement about John's theological accomplishments with regard to the term ἐνυπόστατος and the insubsistence formula. In both cases, the analyses of John's texts shed new light on the relevant traditions before John. He is definitely the author whose works fulfil both criteria for a Loofsian interpretation of our term most clearly and whose Christology assigns to the insubsistence formula the most prominent role. Although he failed to integrate Maximus' congenial synthesis of Christology and trinitarian theology into his teaching, he clarified and made explicit many aspects of the hypostasis-concept we could only assume as implicit in many of our earlier texts. Thus, he deserves his prominent final position in the history of the early church just as in this terminological survey.

⁶⁷⁴ Cf. esp. *Volunt.* 2,15–33 (PTS 22, 174f.): Διὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ τοῦ σώματος σχῆμα καὶ ὁ τῆς ὕψεως χαρακτήρ καὶ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν υἱὸν τῆς παρθένου πρὸς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ ἀσχημάτιστον οὐχ ὑποστάσεων εἰσιν διαφόρων ἀφοριστικά, ἀλλὰ διαφόρων φύσεων, μίας δὲ ὑποστάσεως ἀφορίζοντα αὐτὴν ἐκ τῶν ὁμοουσίων αὐτῇ κατὰ τὴν αὐτῆς θεότητα, ὑποστάσεων τοῦ πατρὸς φημι καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ τῶν ὁμοουσίων αὐτῇ κατὰ τὴν αὐτῆς ἀνθρωπότητα ὑποστάσεων, τῆς μητρὸς φημι καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀνθρώπων· ὅτε γὰρ ἐκ δύο φύσεων μία ὑπόστασις σύνθετος γένηται, ταῦτά τε κάκεῖνα, τὰ τε τῆς θείας τυχὸν φύσεως φυσικὰ τε καὶ ὑποστατικὰ ἰδιώματα καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως συστατικὰ γίνεται. "Ὅθεν ὁ Χριστὸς θεὸς τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἀναρχος καὶ ἡργμένος ἢ αὐτῇ μία ὑπόστασις, ὁρατὴ καὶ ἀόρατος, κτιστὴ καὶ ἄκτιστος, περιγραπτὴ καὶ ἀπερίγραπτος, παθητὴ καὶ ἀπαθής, υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ υἱὸς παρθένου εἴτουν ἀνθρώπου, ἀμήτωρ ἐκ πατρὸς, ἀπάτωρ ἐκ μητρὸς, προαιώνιος καὶ πρόσφατος, ἀσχημάτιστος καὶ ἐν μορφῇ δούλου καὶ ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου, "ὥραῖος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων". Ταῦτα πάντα συστατικὰ καὶ χαρακτηριστικὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑποστάσεως καὶ ἐκ πάντων ὁμοῦ καὶ ἐξ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου κατονομάζεται.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY

Finally, this complicated and extensive examination of the history of a mainly theological term used in many different ways throughout the Christian literature from the third up to the eighth century calls for a concluding summary and recapitulation, which will also give us the chance to tackle the problem we have avoided almost entirely throughout our examination by leaving ἐνυπόστατος untranslated: Which appropriate English equivalent can be found for our term in the different contexts and meanings it occurs in? Is the translation ‘enhypostasized’, ‘enhypostatic’ or even ‘insubsistent’ possible? In answering this question we will have to return to both our introductory alternative, whether our term parallels ἔνυλος = enmattered or rather ἔνυλος = material, and to the problem of a possible comparison or analogy between the ‘insubsisting’ human nature of Christ and the ‘insubsisting’ accidents, genera and species.

In the first part of our examination, we were focussing on the origin of our term and its first technical specification within the trinitarian debates of the fourth and fifth century. It turned out to be a counterpart for the classical ἀνυπόστατος exclusively used by Christian authors in quite a variety of meanings, such as true, real, substantial, personified, and was applied not only to God, the Logos or another trinitarian person, but also to virtues or arguments—an application which did not vanish completely in the later centuries,⁶⁷⁵ yet seems to be just as overshadowed by the Christological significance of the term as the technical, more specific trinitarian one denoting the hypostatical independence of mainly the second, but also the third trinitarian person, which is of real prominence among the later authors only in John of Damascus.⁶⁷⁶

The second, main part of our investigation was dedicated to the Christological application of our term, especially its possible connection to the Neochalcedonian insubsistence-concept, to which the results of our first

⁶⁷⁵ Cf. ab. nn. 501f., 586f.

⁶⁷⁶ Cf. ab. nn. 590–600. In my opinion, only Ps-Caesarius (ab. n. 141) might count as a real exception. The occurrences in Leontius of Jerusalem (n. 429), Maximus (n. 497) or Anastasius of Sinai (n. 585) are, however, very rare and casual.

part did not seem favourable at all: within the trinitarian discussions, we were unable to detect any adaptations or alterations of the very basic meaning ‘hypostatical’ (‘existing as a hypostasis’), ‘subsistent’, ‘real’, distinguishing the entity it was attributed to either from a merely accidental reality (‘the ἐνυπόστατος λόγος is not just a thought of the father’) or from a merely apparent reality (‘the ἐνυπόστατος, ζῶν λόγος is not like the dead idols of the heathens’). Having to face the Nestorian and Monophysite objection against the Chalcedonian dogma that no nature can be anhypostatical or without hypostasis,⁶⁷⁷ its defenders from John the Grammarian onwards thus postulated a distinction between a wider and narrower sense of ἐνυπόστατος allowing for the natures in Christ only the wider one, ‘reality as such’, not the narrower of ‘independent reality’—the strategy we called the ‘twofold use tradition’, fully based on the equation $x \text{ ἐνυπόστατον} = \text{hypostasis of } x$. Yet, in contrast to the trinitarian debate, the term is applied here in most cases with a mitigating connotation: An ἐνυπόστατον does not have to be a hypostasis in the full sense, but just something like a hypostasis—a good example for what Schwyzer called the approximative sense of the prefix.⁶⁷⁸ Thus, this tradition finally must in some measure break with its own starting point, as it is bound to the theological task of arguing for the unity of Christ’s hypostasis and against the necessity of postulating a human hypostasis in Christ. In the end, it has to restrict ἐνυπόστατος to the wider sense of (however) ‘real’ and to oppose it to hypostasis, which is now exclusively used for the independent reality.⁶⁷⁹ Hence, the translation ‘real’ would in those texts probably be the best, but ‘hypostatical’ is rather problematic.

Although also the insubsistence-concept actually comes into the Christological debate right at the introduction of our term, it did, however, not immediately affect its meaning. The claim that Christ’s human nature can by no means have subsisted before its being united with the hypostasis of the Logos, which John the Grammarian took from the pseudo-Athanasian letter to Jovianus, rather results from the attempt to apply the Porphyrio-Cappadocian hypostasis-conception to Christology and thus have the unity of Christ’s hypostasis constituted by the unity of its origin. This attempt triggered various systematical problems to be dealt with by the authors from the second half of the sixth century onwards, who—having to face the acute monophysite philosopher John Philoponus and his tritheistic attack

⁶⁷⁷ Cf. ab. n. 149.

⁶⁷⁸ Cf. ab. n. 20.

⁶⁷⁹ Cf. ab. on the *Doctrina patrum*.

on the orthodox trinitarian and Christological framework—had to elaborate the insubsistence-conception within a broader systematical horizon. In our treatment of Anastasius I. of Antioch we saw two major problems of this conception of hypostasis and insubsistence arising: (a) How is a human individuality of Christ possible, if his human nature receives its individuation entirely from the Logos? (b) How can the second person of the trinity retain its unity and inalterability, if it is said to mark off not only the Logos from its divine species-members, but also Jesus from his human ones? As to the first problem, the more or less unanimous Chalcedonian answer had already been given by John the Grammarian: insubsistence is not about denying human individual properties, like black hair or snubnosedness to Christ, but about having his hypostasis constituted by a certain unique mark of his biography, by a specific divine mode of existence, which would be called the son-like *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως* later on by Maximus. As to the second problem the solutions differed between fairly crude ones like Leontius' of Jerusalem idiom composition and fairly refined ones on the basis of the Logos-tropos-distinction, as in Anastasius I. and Maximus.

Those discussions were, however, almost exclusively relevant for the development of the insubsistence-concept and did not really affect the meaning of *ἐνυπόστατος* itself. In this respect, the important shift was actually marked by Leontius of Byzantium. Unlike John the Grammarian's, his approach did not proceed from the common usage of the term, but immediately from the relevant theological problem: the refutation of the 'no nature without hypostasis' objection or the claim of a second, human hypostasis being entailed by a remaining duality of natures in Christ. His sharp distinction between the hypostasis and the *φύσεις ἐνυπόστατοι* hypostatically realized *in* it was to prove groundbreaking for new metaphysical reflections on the relationship between nature and hypostasis, which, however, in the case of Leontius do not show any connection to the specifically Christological insubsistence conception. He did, however, take into account several aspects of the philosophical discussion about 'being in a subject', which is described as the opposite of proper substantiality at the beginning of Aristotle's *Categories*, yet applied with certain modifications also to specific differences or substantial qualities, universal natures (genera and species) and immattered forms. Thus, Leontius issued a second tradition concerning the use of our term, the 'distinction tradition', as we called it, according to which a translation as 'hypostatically realised', 'enhypostastic' or 'enhypostasized' (as adopted especially by Maximus-scholars) would be preferable to the rather misleading 'hypostatical' or, even less precise, 'real'.

In the following discussions, the systematical superiority of the ‘distinction-tradition’ becomes just as evident as the fact that this tradition does actually lend itself to a combination with the Neochalcedonian insubistence-concept, even if most authors are anxious to make sure that the insubistence is by no means to be conceived as an accidental or quasi-accidental one. Thus, Ephrem of Amid and many after him were—as to etymology—naïve enough to anticipate the modern misunderstanding of the Greek prefix in determining the ἐνυπόστατον as what is ‘in’ a hypostasis, yet all in specifying the inexistent entity as non-accidental, i.e. as a genus, species or as a specific hypostatical property. The ontological technicalities involved here are most profoundly discussed in Maximus, where the term, however, still signifies the relationship of any nature to any hypostasis a parte naturae in general, not particularly that of Christ’s human nature to the hypostasis of the divine Logos. A translation as ‘enhypostatic’ in the full Loofian sense is, as we have seen, at best possible in John of Damascus, but only if one dismisses the Maximian symmetry in the use of our term displayed from time to time as nothing but a traditional left-over. But at all events, the ‘distinction tradition’ clearly parallels our term with ἔνυλος = enmattered,⁶⁸⁰ whereas the ‘twofold use tradition’ rather seems to think of ἔνυλος = material.

Hence, we have more or less confirmed Lampe’s meanings A/B/C 1 (“being a hypostasis, having independent existence, substantive”) and A 2 (“real, concrete, actual”), under which, however, his meanings A 3 (“being the embodiment of, incarnate”)⁶⁸¹ and A 7 (“existent”: twofold-use-tradition) have to be subsumed as well. His meaning A 4 (“being, existing in a hypostasis, enhypostatic”) corresponds to our distinction-tradition, which in the Christological application (C 2) is unfortunately conflated with some texts from the twofold-use tradition. His meanings A 6 (“interior”) and A 5 (“subsistent in, established in the very nature, inherent”) appear, however, untenable to me as they stand. A 6 rests upon a similar misinterpretation of a passage from Diadochus Photiciensis as his proposal “self-contained” for Macar-

⁶⁸⁰ Cf. Nemesius, *De natura hominis* 2; ed. Morani, 18,10–15 (quoting Numenius): εἰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ δύναμις ὕλη τις ἐστίν, τοῖς αὐτοῖς πάλιν χρῆσθμεθα λόγοις· εἰ δὲ οὐχ ὕλη ἀλλ’ ἔνυλον (ἕτερον δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ἔνυλον παρὰ τὴν ὕλην, τὸ γὰρ μετέχον ὕλης ἔνυλον λέγεται) τί ποτε ἄρα ἐστὶ τὸ μετέχον τῆς ὕλης, πότερον ὕλη καὶ αὐτὸ ἢ ἄνυλον; εἰ μὲν οὖν ὕλη, πῶς ἔνυλον καὶ οὐχ ὕλη; εἰ δὲ οὐχ ὕλη, ἄνυλον ἄρα· εἰ δὲ ἄνυλον, οὐ σῶμα, πᾶν γὰρ σῶμα ἔνυλον.

⁶⁸¹ Cf. ab. nn. 45–47.

ius/Symeon under A 1.⁶⁸² Much more interesting for our task is of course A 5, a meaning which—according to our examinations—might only be considered if one clarifies the philosophical concept behind the metaphor and distinctly rules out the misunderstanding of such an insubsistence as (quasi-)accidental. Judging from the references he adduces, Lampe's postulate of such a meaning rests on the apparent possibility of a construction of our term with a dative, as one might suppose in the following sentence from Gregory of Nyssa:

πάντοτε γὰρ ἐνεργὸν καὶ ἐνούσιον καὶ ἐνυπόστατον τῇ αἰδίῳ φύσει τὸ ἀγαθὸν τε καὶ τὸ αἰδῖον ἐνθεωρεῖται θέλημα, οὔτε ἀπὸ τινος ἰδιαζούσης ἀρχῆς ἐγγινόμενον οὔτε δῖχα τοῦ θελήτου νοηθῆναι δυνάμενον.⁶⁸³

However, the dative τῇ αἰδίῳ φύσει does not depend on ἐνυπόστατος here, but on ἐνθεωρεῖται. The good and eternal will is, according to Gregory, perceived as always active, substantial and hypostatic in the eternal nature (not in the mortal one, where will is neither substantial nor hypostatic). 'Ἐνυπόστατος means 'to be in a hypostasis' and can thus, just like ἔνυλος = enmattered, not be combined with an additional dative-indication of the 'substratum' 'in' which the entity our term refers to inheres.⁶⁸⁴ Yet, from a systematic point of

⁶⁸² Cf. ab. n. 62. Diadochus Photicensis, *Ceph. gnost.* 31 was correctly interpreted already by its editor and translator des Places as "combat corps à corps" or "guerre personnelle" (Diadoque de Photicé, *Oeuvres spirituelles*, Paris 1955 [SC 5], 101 and n. 1), i.e. a proper battle of hypostases as opposed to a merely imaginary one. In the sense of "hypostatical" as "belonging to a hypostasis" the term had of course already been in use earlier, e.g. in the first pseudo-Athanasian dialogue on the trinity, where man qua image of God is set apart from Christ qua impress of the Father the following way (MSG 28, 1124C): οὐ μὴν χαρακτήρ ἐστι τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ πεποιηκότος, ἀλλ' ἡ ἄρα τῆς ἐνεργείας. 'Ο δὲ Υἱὸς χαρακτήρ ἐνυπόστατος. Λέγει γάρ· "Ὁ ἑωρακὴς ἐμέ ἑώρακε τὸν Πατέρα μου." οὐδεὶς δέ, ἑωρακῶς ἄνθρωπον, εἶδε τὸν Πατέρα. This passage was most probably resumed in the Didymus-passage quoted n. 96, where the abbreviation, however, slightly alters the meaning of our term.

⁶⁸³ *Contra Eunomium* III,6,17; ed. Jaeger, vol. 2, 181.

⁶⁸⁴ Accordingly, Lampe's insertion of τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ into the Cyril phrase (cf. n. 111) is incorrect, as will immediately become clear in the light of the parallels we adduced ab. n. 59. Lampe's other references have already been treated above in our one-by-one analysis of authors. In case of Jerome of Jerusalem, *De effectu baptismi* (ed. G.M. de Durand, Paris 2000 [SC 455], 348), he incorrectly refers the phrase ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τοῦ (πραγμάτων) ἐνυποστάτων rather than to διδάσκει. A passage Lampe does not adduce, where our term is *prima facie* combined with a dative, is Macarius/Symeon, *Homily* 16,1,11–14 (PTS 4, 158): οἱ λέγοντες ἐνυπόστατον τὸ κακὸν οὐδὲν ἴσασι. θεῷ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐστὶ κακὸν ἐνυπόστατον κατὰ τὸ ἀπαθεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ θεικόν. ἡμῖν δέ ἐστιν ἐνεργούν ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ αἰσθήσει, πάσας ἐπιθυμίας ῥυπαράς ὑποβάλλον. However, I take the datives θεῷ and ἡμῖν to be absolute *dativi commodi* ("for God, no evil has reality") rather than to depend on ἐνυπόστατος. The only passage I found, where the rendering 'insubsistent', 'inherent' in an accidental sense might be possible, is Ps-Gregory of Nazianzus,

view, in the context of Aristotelian ontology it is really difficult to see how an insubstantiating entity which can by no means be regarded as καθ' αὐτό should be able to obtain an ontological status fundamentally different from that of an accident. The dominant influence of the *Categories* propagating the all-embracing distinction between substance and accident and the absolute ontological primacy of the first individual substance must finally place the secondary substances in an at least quasi-accidental position, as already Aristotle regards them as “determining the quality with reference to a substance” (Cat. 5 3b20). This consequence is particularly evident in *De sectis*, where the derived sense of ἀνυπόστατος originally signifying the accident is transferred to Christ's human and divine nature (MSG 86/I, 1241B). Again, the ‘distinction tradition’ possesses, from a systematic point of view, the better standing. Even if Loofs', Otto's or Stickelberger's extolling of Leon-tius of Byzantium as a metaphysical innovator⁶⁸⁵ is mostly overstated, his distinction was nevertheless also a speculative impulse effective especially in Maximus and also the later Medieval authors. It distracts the attention of ontological analysis away from the relationship of a (substantial) entity to its (accidental) attributes and makes it focus on that between essence and existence of this entity. Even if this distinction is not yet explicitly made in Maximus, the philosophical efforts inspired by our Christological problems did, in my opinion, contribute at least as much to its discovery as did those provoked by the problem of creation.⁶⁸⁶

Fragmentum ex oratione contra astronomos: καὶ δεσμός μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, δεσμός δὲ τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἐνυπόστατος θέρμη, ἥς ἀποψυχωμένης, ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς χωρισμός ἐκ τοῦ σώματος γίνεται, ἀποτηγνυμένου τοῦ αἵματος. (MSG 36, 675B) However, warmth in Aristotelian physics is not just a simple, accidental quality, but one of the four elementary ones constituting every corporeal entity. The correct translation is thus probably also: “the warmth realised or embodied in the blood”.

⁶⁸⁵ Cf. ab. nn. 128 and 130 f.

⁶⁸⁶ They are succinctly expounded by D.B. Burrell, “Aquinas and Islamic and Jewish thinkers”, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*, ed. N. Kretzmann / E. Stump, Cambridge 1993, (60–84) 62–70.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

- Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, ed. E. Schwartz / J. Straub, 4 vols, Berlin 1922–1983.
- Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, ser. II vol. I: *Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum*, ed. R. Riedinger, Berlin 1984.
- Ambrose of Milan, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam*, ed. M. Adriaen, Turnhout 1957 (CCL 14).
- , *Sancti Ambrosii opera*, vol. 2: *De Iacob e.a.*, ed. C. Schenkl, Vienna 1897 (CSEL 32/II).
- Anastasius I. of Antioch, “Des Patriarchen Anastasius I. von Antiochien Jerusalemer Streitgespräch mit einem Tritheiten”, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, in: *Traditio* 37 (1981), 73–108.
- , *Opera omnia genuina quae supersunt*, ed. S.N. Sakkos, Thessaloniki 1976.
- Anastasius Sinaita, *Viae dux*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, Turnhout 1981 (CCG 8).
- , *Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis necnon opuscula adversus Monothetas*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, Turnhout 1985 (CCG 12).
- , “Antimonophysitische Aporien des Anastasius Sinaites”, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, in: *ByZ* 74 (1981), 11–26.
- , *Anastasii Sinaitae quaestiones et responsiones*, ed. M. Richard/J.A. Munitiz, Turnhout 2006 (CCG 59).
- Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen*, ed. H. Lietzmann, Tübingen 1904.
- Aristotle, *Organon*, ed. H.G. Zekl, 4 vols, Hamburg 1997/98 (PhB 492–494).
- , *Über die Seele*, ed. H. Seidl, Hamburg 1995 (PhB 476).
- , *Physik*, ed. H.G. Zekl, 2 vols, Hamburg 1987/88 (PhB 380/381).
- , *Metaphysik*, ed. H. Seidl, 2 vols, Hamburg 1:³1989 2:³1991 (PhB 307/308).
- , *Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. I. Bywater, Oxford 1894.
- , *De generatione animalium*, ed. H.J. Drossaart Lulofs, Oxford 1965.
- , *De partibus animalium I and De Generatione animalium I (with passages from II, 1–3)*, tr. D.M. Balme, Oxford ²1992.
- Asterius the Sophist, *Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt*, ed. M. Richard, Oslo 1956 (*Symbolae Osloenses*, fasc. suppl. 16).
- Athanasiana. Five homilies—Expositio fidei—Sermo maior*, ed. H. Nordberg, Helsinki/Helsingfors 1962 (*Commentationes humanarum litterarum* 30.2).
- Athanasius, *Athanasius Werke*, ed. H.G. Opitz e.a., 3 vols, Berlin 1/1–4:1996–2010 2/1–8:1935–2006 3/1–3:1934–2007.
- Basil the Great, *Lettres*, 3 vols, ed. Y. Courtonne, Paris 1:1957 2:1961 3:1966.
- , *Sur le Saint-Esprit*, ed. B. Pruche, Paris ²1968 (SC 17).
- Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta*, ed. S. Brandt, Leipzig 1906 (CSEL 48).
- Catenae graecorum patrum in Novum testamentum*, ed. J.A. Cramer, 5 vols, Oxford 1:1840 2:1841 3:1838 4:1844 5:1841.

- Chemnitz, M., *De duabus naturis in Christo*, Jena 1591.
- Clement of Alexandria, *Protreptikos und Paedagogus*, ed. O. Stählin, Leipzig 1905 (GCS 12).
- Collection des anciens alchimistes grecs*, ed. M. Berthelot and C.É. Ruelle, vol. 2, Paris 1888 (repr. London 1963).
- Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, ed. Royal Prussian Academy of Science, 23 vols + 3 suppl, Berlin 1883–1907.
- The Philosophy of the Commentators 200–600 AD. A Sourcebook*, ed. R. Sorabji, 3 vols, London 2004.
- Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, ed. J.C.T. Otto, vol. 4, Jena ³1880 (repr. Wiesbaden 1969).
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 3 vols, ed. P.E. Pusey, Oxford 1872 (repr. Brussels 1965).
- , *Dialogues sur la Trinité*, 3 vols, ed. G.M. de Durand, Paris 1:1976 2:1977 3:1978 (SC 231, 237, 246).
- , *Deux dialogues christologiques*, ed. G.M. de Durand, Paris 1964 (SC 97).
- , *Contre Julien*, ed. P. Burguière and P. Évieux, vol. 1, Paris 1985 (SC 322).
- Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cyrilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. W.C. Reischl and J. Rupp, 2 vols, Munich 1:1848 2:1860.
- Denys the Areopagite, *Corpus Dionysiacum I: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus*, ed. B.R. Suchla, Berlin 1990 (PTS 33).
- , *Corpus Dionysiacum II: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De coelesti hierarchia, de ecclesiastica hierarchia, de mystica theologia, epistulae*, ed. G. Heil and A.M. Ritter, Berlin 1991 (PTS 36).
- [———], *Corpus Dionysiacum IV/1: Ioannis Scythopolitani prologus et scholia in Dionysii Areopagitae librum In Divinis Nominibus cum additamentis interpretum aliorum*, ed. B.R. Suchla, Berlin/Boston 2011 (PTS 62).
- Diadochus of Photice, *Oeuvres spirituelles*, ed. E. des Places, Paris 1955 (SC 5).
- Didymus the Blind, *Didyme l'Aveugle sur Zacharie*, ed. L. Doutreleau, vol. 2, Paris 1962 (SC 84).
- , *Didyme l'Aveugle sur la Genèse*, ed. P. Nautin and L. Doutreleau, vol. 1, Paris 1976 (SC 233).
- , *De trinitate, Buch 1*, ed. J. Hönscheid, Meisenheim am Glan 1975 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 44).
- , *De trinitate, Buch 2, Kapitel 1–7*, ed. I. Seiler, Meisenheim am Glan 1975 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 52).
- Diversorum postchalconensium auctorum collectanea*, ed. J.H. Declerck / P. Allen, Leuven 1989 (CCG 19).
- Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts. Zum ersten Male vollständig herausgegeben und untersucht von Franz Diekamp*, ed. E. Chrysos, Münster ²1981.
- Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, ed. H. Denzinger/A. Schönmetzer, Freiburg 36th ed. 1976.
- Epiphanius, *Ancoratus und Panarion*, ed. K. Holl, 3 vols, Leipzig 1:1915 2:1922; 3:1933 (GCS 25, 31, 37).
- “Eugenius of Ancyra, Markellianer und Athanasius von Alexandrien. Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasium des Diakons Eugenios von Ankyra”, ed. M. Tetz, in: ZNW 64 (1973), 78–84.

- Eusebius of Cesarea, *Eusebius Werke*, Vol. 4: *Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcells*, ed. E. Klostermann and G.C. Hansen, Berlin ²1972 (GCS 14).
- , *Eusebius Werke*, Vol. 6: *Die Demonstratio evangelica*, ed. I.A. Heikel, Leipzig 1913 (GCS 23).
- Eutychius of Constantinople, "L'Opusculo di Eutichio patriarcha di Constantinopoli sulla distinzione della natura e persona", transl. P. Paolo Ananian, in: *Armenica. Mélanges d'études Armeniennes publiés à l'occasion du 250^e anniversaire de l'entrée des pères mekhitaristes dans l'île de St. Lazare*, Venedig 1969, 355–382.
- Faustinus Luciferanus, *De trinitate*, ed. R. Simonetti, Turnhout 1967 (CCL 69).
- Filastrius Brixensis, *Diversarum hereseon liber*, ed. V. Bulhart, Turnhout 1957 (CCL 9).
- Galen, *Galen de usu parium libri XVII*, ed. G. Helmreich, 2 vols, Leipzig 1:1907 2:1909.
- , *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. C.G. Kühn, vol. 7, Leipzig 1824 (repr. Hildesheim 1965).
- Ps-Galen, *De signis ex urinis*, ed. P. Moraux, "Anecdota Graeca minora IV", in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 60 (1985), 68–74.
- Gennadius of Constantinople, "Le patriarche Gennade de Constantinople (458–471) et un opusculé inédit contre les Nestoriens", ed. J. Declerck, in: *Byzantion* 60 (1990), 130–144.
- Gerhard, J., *Loci theologici*, ed. J.F. Cotta, Vol. 3, Tübingen 1764.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques)*, ed. P. Gallay, Paris 1978 (SC 250).
- , *Lettres théologiques*, ed. P. Gallay, Paris 1974 (SC 208).
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, ed. W. Jaeger e.a., 10 vols, Leiden 1921–2009.
- Heidianus, A., *Corpus theologiae christianae*, Leiden 1686.
- Hermeias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, ed. P. Couvreur, Paris 1901 (repr. Hildesheim 1971).
- Hermogenes, *De statibus*, ed. G. Kowalski, Bratislava 1947.
- Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte, 2 Vols., Copenhagen 1:1952 2:1966.
- Hilary of Poitiers, *De trinitate*, ed. P. Smulders, Turnhout 1980 (CCL 62A).
- Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin 1986 (PTS 25).
- , *Tertullian. Adversus Praxean/Gegen Praxeas. Im Anhang: Contra Noetum/Gegen Noet*, ed. H.-J. Sieben, Freiburg e.a. 2001 (FC 34).
- Hollaz, D., *Examen theologicum acroamaticum*, ed. R. Tellerus, Stockholm/Leipzig 1750.
- Irenaeus, *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses*, ed. W.W. Harvey, vol. 2, Cambridge 1857.
- , *Gegen die Häresien*, 5 vols, ed. N. Brox, Freiburg e.a. 1–2/4:1993 3:1995 5:2001 (FC 8/1–5).
- Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, ed. J. Reuss, Berlin 1966 (TU 89).
- John of Cesarea, *Iohannis Caesariensis presbyteri et grammatici opera quae supersunt*, ed. M. Richard, Turnhout 1977 (CCG 1).
- John Chrysostomus, "Discours inédit sur les chaînes de S. Pierre attribué à S. Jean Chrysostome", ed. E. Batareikh, in: *Χρυσσοστομικά* 3 (1908).
- John of Damascus, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 5 vols, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1:1969 2:1973 3:1975 4:1981 5:1988 (PTS 7, 12, 17, 22, 29).

- , *Die Philosophischen Kapitel des Johannes von Damaskus*, ed. G. Richter, Stuttgart 1982 (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 15).
- John Philoponus, *De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum*, ed. H. Rabe, Leipzig 1899 (repr. Hildesheim 1963).
- , *De opificio mundi*, ed. C. Scholten, Vol. 1, Freiburg 1997 (FC 23/1).
- Julian Apostata, *L'empereur Julien. Oeuvres complètes*, ed. C. Lacombrade, vol. II/2, Paris 1964.
- Junius, F., *Defensio catholicae doctrinae de s. trinitate*, Geneva 1613.
- Justinian, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, ed. M. Amelotti e.a., Milan 1973.
- Leontius of Byzantium, *Leontius of Byzantium: A critical edition of his works with prolegomena*, ed. B.E. Daley, Dissertation Oxford 1978.
- Leontius of Jerusalem, *Against the Monophysites: Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae*, ed. P.T.R. Gray, Oxford 2006.
- Het traktaat de sectis (Ps. Leontius Byzantinus)*, ed. M. Waegeman, 4 Vols., Dissertation Gent 1982.
- Macarius / Symeon, *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, ed. H. Dörries, E. Klostermann and M. Krüger, Berlin 1964 (PTS 4).
- Marcellus of Ancyra, *Die Fragmente und der Brief an Julius v. Rom*, ed. M. Vinzent, Leiden 1997.
- Mark the monk, *Traités*, ed. G.M. Durand, 2 vols, Paris 1:1999 2:2000 (SC 445 and 455).
- Martini, M., *Christiana et catholica fides*, Bremen 1618.
- Maximus the confessor, *Maximi confessoris Ambigua ad Thomam cum epistula secunda ad eundem*, ed. B. Janssens, Turnhout 2002 (CCG 48).
- , *Mystagogia*, ed. C. Boudignon, Turnhout 2011 (CCG 69).
- , *Maximi confessoris quaestiones ad Thalassium*, ed. C. Laga and C. Steel, 2 vols, Turnhout 1:1980, 2:1990 (CCG 7 & 22).
- , *Maximi confessoris quaestiones et dubia*, ed. J.H. Declerck, Turnhout 1982 (CCG 10).
- , *Anonymus in Ecclesiasten commentarius qui dicitur catena trium patrum*, ed. S. Lucà, Turnhout 1983 (CCG 11).
- , *Maximi confessoris opuscula exegetica duo*, ed. P. van Deun, Turnhout 1991 (CCG 23).
- , “Le deuxième lettre à Thomas de S. Maxime le confesseur”, ed. P. Canart, in: *Byzantion* 34 (1964), 428–445.
- Meisner, B., *Christologiae sacrae disputationes L*, Wittenberg 1624.
- Monophysite texts of the sixth century*, ed. A. v. Roey/P. Allen, Leuven 1994.
- Nemesius of Emesa, *De natura hominis*, ed. M. Morani, Leipzig 1987.
- Nestorius, *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, trans. F. Nau, Paris 1910.
- A Nestorian collection of Christological texts: Cambridge University Library ms. oriental 1319*, ed. L. Abramowski, 2 Vols, Cambridge 1972.
- Niceta of Remesiana, *His life and works*, ed. A.E. Burn, Cambridge 1905.
- Olympiodorus Diaconus, *Olympiodor Diakon von Alexandria. Kommentar zu Hiob*, ed. U. Hagedorn / D. Hagedorn, Berlin 1984 (PTS 24).
- Origen, *Commentaire sur saint Jean*, ed. C. Blanc, vol. 1 (Livre I–IV), Paris 1966 (SC 120).
- , *Origenes Matthäuserklärung III. Fragmente und Indices*, ed. E. Benz / E. Klostermann, Leipzig 1941 (GCS 41).

- Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne, 161 vols, Paris 1857 ff.
- Philo of Alexandria, *De aeternitate mundi*, ed. R. Arnaldez/J. Pouilloux, Paris 1969.
- Philoxenus of Mabbug, *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, ed. A. de Halleux, Louvain 1963 (CSCO 232).
- Photius, *Bibliothèque*, ed. R. Henry, 8 vols, Paris 1959–1977.
- Plato, *Werke*, ed. G. Eigler, 8 vols, Darmstadt ²1990.
- Plotinus, *Plotins Schriften*, hg. R. Harder/R. Beutler/W. Theiler, 6 vols, Hamburg 1:1956; 2:1960; 3:1964; 4:1967; 5:1960; 6:1971 (PhB 211–215; 276).
- Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, ed. E.R. Dodds, Oxford ²1963.
- , *Procli philosophi Platonici opera inedita*, ed. V. Cousin, pt. 3., Paris 1864 (repr. Hildesheim 1961).
- , *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem commentaria*, ed. C. Steel/C. Mace/P. d'Hoine, 3 vols, Oxford 1:2007 2:2008 3:2009.
- , *Procli Diadochi in primum Euclidis elementorum librum commentarii*, ed. G. Friedlein, Leipzig ²1873 (repr. Hildesheim 1992).
- , *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, ed. E. Diehl, 3 vols, Leipzig 1:1903; 2:1904; 3:1906 (repr. Amsterdam 1965).
- Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*, ed. E. Mühlenberg, 2 vols, Berlin 1:1975 2:1977 (PTS 15, 16).
- Ps-Athanasius, *Dialoghi contro i Macedoniani*, ed. E. Cavalcanti, Torino 1983.
- [———], *Dialoghi IV e V sulla santa trinità (testo greco con traduzione italiana, versione latina e armena)*, ed. A. Capone, Leuven 2011 (CSCO subs. 125).
- Ps-Caesarius, *Die Erotapokriseis*, ed. R. Riedinger, Berlin 1989.
- Ps-Dionysius of Alexandria, “Eine fingierte Korrespondenz mit Paulus dem Samosatener, ed. E. Schwartz”, in: *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse*, München 1927.
- Quenstedt, J.A., *Theologia didactico-polemica*, vol. 3, Wittenberg 1691.
- Una raccolta di opuscoli Calcedonensi (Ms Sinai Syr. 10)*, ed. P. Bettio, Leuven 1974/79 (CSCO 403/4).
- Romanos Melodos, *Hymnes*, ed. J. Grosdidier de Matons, vol. 4, Paris 1967 (SC 128).
- Rufinus of Aquileia, *Opera*, ed. M. Simonetti, Turnhout 1961 (CCL 20).
- Secundus taciturnus, *Secundus the silent philosopher*, ed. B.E. Perry, Ithaca/New York 1964.
- Severus of Antioch, *Contra impium grammaticum*, ed. J. Lebon, Louvain 1952 (CSCO 111/112).
- , *Severi Antiocheni Orationes ad Nephaliu eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici Epistulae mutuae*, ed. J. Lebon, Louvain 1949 (CSCO 119/120).
- , *Philaethes*, ed. R. Hespel, Louvain 1952 (CSCO 133/134).
- Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Physicists. Against the Ethicists*, ed. R.G. Bury, Cambridge 1960.
- Simplicius, *Commentaire sur les Catégories*, ed. I. Hadot, 2 vols, Leiden e.a. 1990 (PhA 50/51).
- Socrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen, Berlin 1995 (GCS NF 1).
- Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, ed. J. von Arnim, 4 vols, Stuttgart 1968.
- Stobaeus, J., *Anthologium*, ed. C. Wachsmuth/O. Hense, 5 vols, Berlin 1958.
- Tertullian, *Opera pars II: Opera montanistica*, ed. A. Kroymann e.a., Turnhout 1954 (CCL 2).

- Theodore of Raithu, *Praeparatio*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica. Texte und Abhandlungen zur griechischen Patristik*, Rome 1938 (OCA 117), 185–222.
- Theophilus of Antioch, *Theophili Antiocheni Ad Autolycum*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin / New York 1995 (PTS 44).
- Zacharias rhetor, *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae rhetori vulgo adscripta*, ed. E.W. Brooks, 4 vols, Louvain 1953 (CSCO 83/84.87/88).

LITERATURE

- Abramowski, L., “συνάφεια und ἀσύγχυτος ἕνωσις als Bezeichnung für trinitarische und christologische Einheit”, in: *Drei christologische Untersuchungen*, Berlin / New York 1981 (BZNW 45), 63–109.
- , “Ein nestorianischer Traktat bei Leontius von Jerusalem”, in: *III. Symposium Syriacum (1980). Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures*, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1983, 43–55.
- , “Trinitarische und christologische Hypostasenformeln”, in: *Formula and Context. Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Hampshire 1992, 38–49.
- Andrist, P., “Les protagonistes égyptiens du débat apollinariste. Le Dialogue d’Athanasie et Zachée et les dialogues pseudoathanasiens”, in: *Recherches augustiniennes et patristiques* 34 (2005), 63–141.
- Balss, H., “Die Zeugungslehre und Embryologie in der Antike. Eine Übersicht”, in: *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin* 5 (1936), 1–82.
- von Balthasar, H.U., *Kosmische Liturgie. Zum Weltbild Maximus’ des Bekenners*, Einsiedeln 1961.
- Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, tr. G.W. Bromiley/T.F. Torrance, 4 vols, London/New York 2004.
- Bathrellos, D., *The Byzantine Christ: person, nature and will in the Christology of St. Maximus the Confessor*, Oxford 2004.
- Bausenhardt, G., *“In allem uns gleich außer der Sünde”. Studien zum Beitrag Maximus’ des Bekenners zur altkirchlichen Christologie*, Tübingen 1990.
- Benakis, L., “The Problem of General Concepts in Neoplatonism and Byzantine Thought”, in: *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, ed. D.J. O’Meara, Albany, 1982, 75–86.
- Bizer, C., *Studien zu pseudathanasianischen Dialogen. Der Orthodoxos und Aetios*, Dissertation, Bonn 1970.
- Burrell, D.B., “Aquinas and Islamic and Jewish thinkers”, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*, ed. N. Kretzmann / E. Stump, Cambridge 1993, 60–84.
- Carcione, F., “Il *De sectis* di Leonzio Scolastico: Un testimone della scuola Chalcedonense in Egitto al tempo del patriarca Zoilo”, in: *Ricerche e studi sull’oriente cristiano* 6 (2002), 101–120.
- Chesnut, R., *Three monophysite Christologies. Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug*, London 1976.
- Chevalier, C., *La Mariologie de St. Jean Damascène*, Rome 1936 (OrChrA 109).
- Clayton, P.B., *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus. Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, Oxford 2007.

- Conticello, V.S., "Pseudo-Cyril's 'De SS. Trinitate': A Compilation of Joseph the Philosopher", in: *OCF* 61 (1995), 117–129.
- Cross, R., "Individual natures in the Christology of Leontius of Byzantium", in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10 (2002), 245–265.
- , "Perichoresis, Deification, and christological predication in John of Damascus", in: *Medieval Studies* 62 (2000), 69–124.
- , "Gregory of Nyssa on Universals", in: *VigChr* 56 (2002), 372–410.
- Daley, B., "'A Richer Union': Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ", in: *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993), 239–265.
- , "Nature and the 'mode of union': Late patristic models for the personal unity of Christ", in: *The Incarnation: an interdisciplinary symposium on the Incarnation of the son of God*, ed. S. Davis / D. Kendall / G. O'Collins, Oxford 2002, 164–196.
- , *The Christology of Leontius of Byzantium: Personalism or Dialectics?*, Oxford 1979 (ms).
- , "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium", in: *JThS* 27 (1976), 333–369.
- Dörrie, H., "Υπόστασις. Wort und Bedeutungsgeschichte", in: *Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, 13–69.
- Dietrich, A., "Die arabische Version einer unbekannten Schrift des Alexander von Aphrodisias über die differentia specifica", in: *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 1964, 88–148.
- Drecoll, V.H., *Zur Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilios von Cäsarea. Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*, Göttingen 1996.
- Elert, W., *Der Ausgang der altkirchlichen Christologie. Eine Untersuchung über Theodor von Pharan und seine Zeit als Einführung in die alte Dogmengeschichte*, Berlin 1957.
- Ellis, J., "Alexander's Defense of Aristotle's *Categories*", in: *Phronesis* 39 (1994), 69–89.
- van Esbroeck, M., "La date et l'auteur du *De sectis* attribué à Leonce de Byzance", in: *After Chalcedon. Studies in theology and Church history*, ed. C. Laga e.a., Leuven 1985, 415–424.
- Erismann, C., "Non est natura sine persona. The issue of uninstantiated universals from late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages", in: *Methods and Methodologies: Aristotelian Logic East and West 500–1500*, ed. M. Cameron / J. Marenbon, Leiden 2011, 75–91.
- , "A world of hypostases. John of Damascus' rethinking of Aristotle's categorical ontology", in: *Studia Patristica* 50 (2011), 269–287.
- Essen, G., *Die Freiheit Jesu. Der neuchalkedonische Enhypostasiebegriff im Horizont neuzeitlicher Subjekt- und Personalphilosophie*, Regensburg 2001.
- Evans, D.B., *Leontius of Byzantium. An origenist Christology*, Washington 1970.
- Ferrara, D.M., "Hypostatized in the Logos. Leontius of Byzantium, Leontius of Jerusalem and the unfinished business of the council of Chalcedon", in: *Louvain Studies* 22 (1997), 311–327.
- Garrigues, J.-M., "La personne composée du Christ d'après saint Maxime le Confesseur", in: *Revue thomiste* 74 (1974), 181–204.
- Gleede, B., "Vermischt, ausgetauscht und kreuzweis zugesprochen. Zur wechselvollen Geschichte der Idiome Christi in der alten Kirche", in: *Creator est creatura*.

- Luthers Christologie als Lehre von der Idiomenkommunikation*, ed. O. Bayer / B. Gleede, Berlin/New York 2007 (TBT 138), 35–94.
- , *Platon und Aristoteles in der Kosmologie des Proklos. Ein Kommentar zu den 18 Argumenten für die Ewigkeit der Welt bei Johannes Philoponos*, Tübingen 2009 (STAC 54).
- , “Creatio ex nihilo—a genuinely philosophical insight derived from Plato and Aristotle? Some notes on the treatise on the harmony between the two sages”, in: *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 22 (2012), 91–117.
- , “Der Traktat *De sectis* des Abbas Theodor. Eine Handreichung zur Widerlegung der διακρινόμενοι”, in: *Zweite Tübinger Tagung zum christlichen Orient: Ägypten in der Spätantiken Zeit*, ed. D. Bumazhnov e.a., Tübingen 2012 (in print).
- Gockel, M., “A dubious christological formula? Leontius of Byzantium and the anhypostatos-enhypostatos theory”, in: *JThS* 51 (2000), 514–532.
- Graeser, A., “Aspekte der Ontologie in der Kategorienschrift”, in: *Zweifelhaftes im Corpus Aristotelicum. Studien zu einigen Dubia. Akten des 9. Symposium Aristotelicum* (Berlin, 7.–16. September 1981), ed. P. Moraux/J. Wiesner, Berlin/New York 1983, 31–55.
- Grant, R.M., “The Fragments of the Greek Apologists and Irenaeus”, in: *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of R.P. Casey*, Freiburg 1963.
- Gray, P.T.R., “Leontius of Jerusalem’s Case for a ‘Synthetic’ Union in Christ”, in: *Studia Patristica* 18 (1985), 151–154.
- , *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Leiden 1979 (SHCT 20).
- Grillmeier, A., *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, 2 vols, Freiburg e.a. I:1979 II/1:1982 II/2:1989 II/3:2002 II/4:1990.
- , “Der Neu-Chalkedonismus. Um die Berechtigung eines neuen Kapitels in der Dogmengeschichte”, in: *Mit ihm und in ihm: Christologische Forschungen und Perspektiven*, Freiburg 1978, 371–385.
- Grünbeck, E., *Christologische Schriftargumentation und Bildersprache. Zum Konflikt zwischen Metapherninterpretation und dogmatischen Schriftbeweistraditionen in der patristischen Auslegung des 44. (45.) Psalms*, Leiden 1994.
- Guillaumont, A., “Justinien et l’église de Perse”, in: *DOP* 23/24 (1969/70), 41–66.
- Hammerschmidt, E., “Einige philosophisch-theologische Grundbegriffe bei Leontius v. Byzanz, Johannes v. Damaskus und Theodor Abu Qurra”, in: *Ostkirchliche Studien* 4 (1955), 147–154.
- Hammerstaedt, J., art. “Hypostasis”, in: *RAC* Vol. 16 (1994), 986–1035.
- Heinzer, F., *Gottes Sohn als Mensch. Die Struktur des Menschseins Christi bei Maximus Confessor*, Fribourg 1980.
- Helmer, S., *Der Neuchalkedonismus. Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffs*, Dissertation Bonn 1962.
- Heppe, H., *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-refomirten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, Elberfeld 1861.
- Heron, A.I.C., “The two pseudo-athanasian dialogues against the anhomoeans”, in: *JThS* 34 (1973), 101–122.
- Hübner, R.M., “Die Hauptquelle des Epiphanius (Panarion, haer. 65) über Paulus von Samosata: Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos”, in: *ZKG* 90 (1979), 55–74.

- Junglas, P., *Leontius von Byzanz. Studien zu seinen Schriften, Quellen und Anschauungen*, Paderborn 1908.
- Kattan, A.E., *Verleiblichung und Synergie. Grundzüge der Bibelhermeneutik bei Maximus Confessor*, Leiden/Boston 2003.
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Creeds*, Singapore 31972.
- Kobusch, T., art. "Individuum, Individualität I", in: HWP IV 1976, col. 300–304.
- Kösters, O., *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius v. Salamis. Ein Kommentar zum Anconatus*, Göttingen 2003.
- Kotter, B., *Die Überlieferung der Pege gnoseos des Hl. Johannes v. Damaskos*, Ettal 1959.
- Krämer, H.J., *Platonismus und hellenistische Philosophie*, Berlin / New York 1971.
- Krausmüller, D., "Leontius of Jerusalem. A theologian of the seventh century", in: JThS 52 (2001), 637–657.
- Kremer, K., *Der Metaphysikbegriff in den Aristoteleskommentaren der Ammonius-Schule*, Münster 1960.
- , "Die Anschauung der Ammonius (Hermeiou)-Schule über den Wirklichkeitscharakter des Intelligiblen. Über einen Beitrag der Spätantike zur platonisch-aristotelischen Metaphysik", in: *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 69 (1961/62), 46–63.
- Lampe, G.W., "A patristic Greek Lexicon", Oxford 2001.
- Lang, U.M., "Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos: Church Fathers, Protestant Orthodoxy and Karl Barth", in: JThS 49 (1998), 630–657.
- , "The date of the treatise *De sectis* revisited", in: *Orientalia Lovaniensia periodica* 29 (1998), 89–98.
- Laurent, V., "Le Symbole Quicumque et l'Église byzantine", in: *Échos d'Orient* 35 (1936), 385–404.
- Lebon, J., "La christologie du monophysisme syrien", in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Vol I: *Der Glaube von Chalkedon*, ed. A. Grillmeier / H.Bacht, Würzburg 1951, 425–580.
- Lesky, E. / Waszink, J.H., art. "Embryologie", in: RAC IV (1959), col. 1228–1244.
- , *Die Zeugungs- und Vererbungslehren der Antike und ihr Nachwirken*, Wiesbaden 1950.
- Liddell, H.G. / Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon. A New Edition revised and augmented throughout by H.S. Jones*, Oxford 1958.
- Lienhard, J.T., *Contra Marcellum. Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*, Washington 1999.
- Lloyd, A.C., "Neoplatonic logic and Aristotelian logic", in: *Phronesis* 1 (1956), 58–72.146–159.
- , *Form and universal in Aristotle*, Liverpool 1981.
- , *The Anatomy of Neoplatonism*, Oxford 1990.
- Loofs, F., "Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche", in: TU 3 (1888), 1–317.
- , "Paulus von Samosata. Eine Untersuchung zur altkirchlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte", in: TU 44/5 (1924), 1–346.
- Louth, A., *Maximus the Confessor*, London / New York 1996.
- , *St. John Damascene: tradition and originality in Byzantine theology*, Oxford 2002.

- MacDonald, J., "Leontius of Jerusalem's *Against the Monophysites* as a possible source for Justinian's *Letter to the Alexandrian monks*", in: *Byzantion* 67 (1997), 375–382.
- Madden, N., "Composite Hypostasis in Maximus the Confessor", in: *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993), 175–197.
- Mann, F., *Lexicon Gregorianum: Wörterbuch zu den Schriften Gregors v. Nyssa*, 7 vols, Leiden 1:1999 2:2000 3:2001 4:2002 5:2003 6:2007 7:2009.
- Maspero, J., *Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises Jacobites (518–616)*, Paris 1923.
- Meyendorff, J., *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, New York 1975.
- Moeller, C., "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI siècle", in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon I*, 637–720.
- , "Textes 'Monophysites' de Léonce de Jerusalem", in: *ETHL* 27 (1951), 467–482.
- Moutafakis, N.J., "Christology and its philosophical complexities in the thought of Leontius of Byzantium", in: *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 10 (1993), 99–119.
- Mühl, M., "Der λόγος ἐνδιάθετος und προφορικός von der älteren Stoa bis zur Synode von Sirmium 351", in: *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 7 (1962), 7–56.
- Mueller-Jourdan, P., *Typologie spatio-temporelle de l'écclesia Byzantine: la Mystagogie de Maxime le confesseur dans la culture philosophique de l'antiquité tardive*, Leiden 2005.
- de Navascués, P., *Pablo di Samosata y sus adversarios. Estudio histórico-teológico del Cristianismo antioqueno en el s. III*, Rome 2004.
- Noret, J., "La rédaction de la Disputation cum Pyrrho de St. Maxime le confesseur serait-elle postérieure à 655?", in: *Analecta Bollandiana* 117 (1999), 291–296.
- Ommanney, G.D.W., *A critical dissertation on the Athanasian creed. Its original language, date, authorship, title, text, reception, and use*, Oxford 1897.
- dell'Osso, C., "Still on the concept of Enhypostaton", in: *Augustinianum* 43 (2003), 63–80.
- , "Leonzio di Bisanzio e Leonzio di Gerusalemme. Una chiara distinzione", in: *Augustinianum* 46 (2006), 231–259.
- Otto, S., *Person und Subsistenz. Die philosophische Anthropologie des Leontius von Byzanz*, Munich 1968.
- Pannenberg, W., *Grundzüge der Christologie*, Gütersloh 5th ed. 1976.
- Payne-Smith, R., *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 2 vols, Oxford 1:1879 2:1901.
- Piret, P., *Le Christ et la trinité selon Maxime le Confesseur*, Paris 1983.
- , "Christologie et théologie trinitaire chez Maxime le Confesseur d'après sa formule des natures 'desquelles, en lesquelles et lesquelles et le Christ'", in: *Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2–5 Septembre 1980*, ed. F. Heinzer / C. Schönborn, Fribourg 1982, 215–222.
- Richard, M., "L'indroduction du mot 'hypostase' dans la théologie de l'incarnation", in: *MSR* 2 (1945), 5–32.243–270.
- , "Léonce de Byzance, était-il origéniste?", in: *REByz* 5 (1947), 31–66.
- , "Le traité *'De sectis'* et Léonce de Byzance", in: *Opera minora*, vol. 2, Turnhout 1977, 695–723.
- , "Léonce et Pamphile", in: *Opera Minora*, vol. 3, Turnhout 1977, 27–52.
- , "Léonce de Jérusalem et Léonce de Byzance", in: *Opera minora*, vol. 3, Turnhout 1977, 53–88.

- , "Anastase le Sinaïte, l'Hodegos et le monothélisme", in: *Opera minora*, vol. 3, Turnhout 1977, 29–42.
- , "Les véritables 'Questions et Réponses' d'Anastase le Sinaïte", in: *Opera minora*, vol. 3, Turnhout 1977, 43–56.
- Richter, G., *Die Dialektik des Johannes von Damaskos. Eine Untersuchung des Textes nach seinen Quellen und seiner Bedeutung*, Ettal 1964.
- Riedinger, R., "Die Lateransynode (649) und Maximos", in: *Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur*, 111–121.
- Riedmatten, H. de, *Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate. Étude sur la christologie du IIIe au IVe siècle*, Fribourg 1952.
- Riou, A., *Le monde et l'église selon Maxime le confesseur*, Paris 1973.
- Rozemond, K., *La Christologie de St. Jean Damascène*, Ettal 1959.
- Scheidweiler, F., "Wer ist der Verfasser des sog. Sermo major de fide?", in: BZ 47 (1954), 333–357.
- Schmid, H., *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, Gütersloh 7th ed. 1893.
- von Schönborn, C., *Sophrone de Jérusalem. Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, Paris 1972.
- Scholten, C., *Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift 'De opificio mundi' des Johannes Philoponos*, Berlin / New York 1996.
- Schwyzler, E., *Griechische Grammatik*, 2 Vols, Munich 1939 2:1950 (HAW 2,1).
- Seibt, K., *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, Berlin/New York 1994 (AKG 59).
- Sherwood, P., *The earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and his refutation of Origenism*, Rome 1955.
- Simonetti, M., "Ancora sulla paternità Didimiana del De trinitate", in: *Augustinianum* 36 (1996), 377–387.
- , "Sulla corrispondenza tra Dionigi di Alessandria e Paolo di Samosata", in: *Augustinianum* 47 (2007), 321–334.
- Sorabji, R., *Matter, Space and Motion. Theories in Antiquity and their sequel*, Ithaca 1988.
- Stead, C., *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*, Cambridge 1994.
- , *Substance and Illusion in the Christian Fathers*, London 1985.
- Steinfath, H., "Die Einheit der Definition (Z 12 und H 6)", in: *Aristoteles, Metaphysik. Die Substanzbücher (Z, H, Q)*, ed. C. Rapp, Berlin 1996 (KA 4), 229–251.
- Strutwolf, H., *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb v. Caesarea. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen 1999.
- Stickelberger, H., "Substanz und Akzidenz bei Leontius von Byzanz. Die Veränderung eines philosophischen Denkmodells durch die Christologie", in: ThZ 36 (1980), 153–161.
- Stiglmayr, J., "Der Verfasser der Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione verbi", in: ByZ 18 (1909), 14–40.
- v. Stockhausen, A., *Athanasius v. Alexandrien: Epistula ad Afros. Einleitung, Kommentar und Übersetzung*, Berlin / New York 2002 (PTS 56).
- Studer, B., *Die theologische Arbeitsweise des Johannes von Damaskus*, Ettal 1956.
- Szlezák, Th.A., *Pseudo-Archytas über die Kategorien*, Berlin / New York 1972.
- Thiel, R., *Aristoteles' Kategorienschrift in ihrer antiken Kommentierung*, Tübingen 2004 (PhU 11).

- Thunberg, L., *Microcosm and Mediator. The theological anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, Lund 1965.
- Tollefsen, T., *The Christocentric cosmology of St. Maximus the Confessor: a study of his metaphysical principles*, Oslo 2000.
- Tornau, C., *Plotin: Enneaden VI 4–5 (22–23). Ein Kommentar*, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1998 (BzA 113).
- Torrance, I.R., *Christology after Chalcedon. Severus of Antioch & Sergius the Monophysite*, Norwich 1988.
- Uthemann, K.H., "Definitionen und Paradigmen in der Rezeption des Dogmas von Chalkedon bis in die Zeit Kaiser Justinians", in: *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, ed. J. van Oort / J. Roldanus, Leuven 1998, 54–122. (repr. Id., *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe. Themen der frühen Kirche als Beiträge zu einer historischen Theologie*, Berlin/Boston 2005 [AKG 93], 37–88).
- , "Der Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monotheletismus. Ein Beitrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus", in: *Studia Patristica* 29 (1997), 373–413 (repr. Id., *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe*, 207–256).
- , "Das anthropologische Modell der hypostatischen Union. Ein Beitrag zu den philosophischen Voraussetzungen und zur innerchalkedonischen Transformation eines Paradigmas", in: *Kleronomia* 14 (1982), 214–312 (repr. Id., *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe*, 103–196).
- , "Sprache und Sein bei Anastasios Sinaites. Eine Semantik im Dienst der Kontroverstheologie", in: *Studia Patristica* 18/1 (1989), 221–231 (repr. Id., *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe*, 367–380).
- Verrycken, K., "The development of Philoponus thought and its chronology", in: *Aristotle Transformed. The Ancient Commentators and their influence*, ed. R. Sorabji, Ithaca 1990, 233–274.
- Völker, W., *Maximus Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*, Wiesbaden 1965.
- Waegeman, M., "The text tradition of the treatise *De sectis* (Ps. Leontius Byzantinus)", in: *L'antiquité classique* 45 (1976), 190–196.
- Wurm, K., *Substanz und Qualität. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation der plotinischen Traktate VI 1, 2 und 3*, Berlin / New York 1973.
- Zachhuber, J.: "Nochmals: Der 38. Brief des Basilius von Caesarea als Werk des Gregor v. Nyssa", in: *ZAC* 7 (2003), 73–90.
- , "Universals in the Greek Church Fathers", in: *Universals in ancient thought*, ed. R. Chiaradonna/G. Galluzzo, Pisa 2012 (forthcoming).
- , "Individuum und Individualität in den theologischen Debatten der Spätantike", in: *Individualität. Genese und Konzeption einer Leitkategorie humaner Selbstdeutung*, ed. W. Gräb/L. Charbonnier, Berlin 2012 (forthcoming).

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

ALEXANDER APHRODISIENSIS

Problemata (CAG suppl. II/2)

18,8–17 71f. n.212

AMBROSIUS

Expositio in Lucam (CCL 14)

I, 5,61 (8) 16 n.35

AMMONIUS HERMIAE

In Categorias commentaria (CAG IV/4)

26,32–27,2 77f.

27,27–30 80

46,11–17 86

In Isagogen commentaria (CAG IV/3)

27,23–28,5 90

39,14–45,15 89–93

103,10–104,12 91f.

109,1–7 81f.

ANASTASIUS ANTIOCHENUS

Dialogus cum Tritheita (ed. K. Uthemann, Traditio 37 [1981])

625–644 (98f.) 119

780f. (103) 173

788–800 (104) 120

908–919 (108) 121f.

Sermones dogmaticae (ed. S. Sakkos, Thessaloniki 1976)

3,19f. (51f.) 151

3,21f. (52) 122 n.415

ANASTASIUS SINAITES

Opuscula adversus Monotheletas

(CCG 12)

I, 14,11f.29f. (22) 162

Quaestiones et responsiones (CCG 59)

21,4f. (40) 160 n.587

Viae dux (CCG 8)

II 3,112–133 102f., 161f.

VIII,2 158f.

X.1/2 159f.

ANONYMUS

Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi

(ed. F. Diekamp/E. Chrysos, Münster 1981)

27 (191–193) 156–158, 165f.

APOLLINARIUS LAODICENUS ET

APOLLINARISTAE

Epistula Dionysii Alexandrini

ad Paulum Samosatenum (ed.

E. Schwartz, München 1927)

5 49f.

27f. 50

Quod unus sit Christus (ed. H.

Lietzmann, Tübingen 1904)

10 (301) 22

11 (301f.) 152 n.550

ARISTOTELES

De anima

I,1 403a29–b18 93

Categoriae

2 1a16–b9 69–83

5 3a7–b23 70, 188

De generatione animalium

I,20 729a9–14 152

Metaphysica

VI,2 1026b21 56

VII,13 1038b8–23

91, 95

IX,7 1049a27–b2

71

Physica

II,1 192b34–193a11

71

IV,2 209b27–30 72

IV,3 210a16–24 72–83

Topica

VI,6 144b31–145a1

11

ASCLEPIUS

In Metaphysicorum libros commentaria (CAG VI/2)

363,21 12 n.23
439,16–31 91f.

ASTERIUS SOPHISTA

Homiliae (ed. M. Richard, Oslo 1956)

21,21 18f.

ATHANASIUS

Epistula ad Afros (ed. H.-C. Brennecke e.a., Berlin 2006)

4,3 (329) 54

De synodis (ed. H.G. Opitz, Berlin 1940)

23,5–7 (249) 29

24 (250) 29

26,6 (254) 29f.

Tomus ad Antiochenos (ed. H.-C. Brennecke e.a., Berlin 2006)

5,4–6,1 (345) 32f.

BASILIUS CAESARENSIS

Quod Deus non est auctor malorum (MSG 31)

341C 21 n.59

BOETHIUS

In Categorias commentaria (MSL 62)

173AB 79

In Isagogen Porphyrii (CSEL 48)

162,16–163,3 94 n.305

CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS

Commentarius in Isaiam (MSG 70)

48C 38

Commentarius in Johannem (ed. E. Pusey, Oxford 1872)

I, 57 39 n.114

I, 69f. 39f.

I, 569 19 n.48

II, 310 39 n.114

Epistulae ad Succensum (ACO I/1/6)

160,14–16 49

De recta fide ad Theodosium (ACO

I/1/1)

50f. 38f., 41

Thesaurus de st. consubstantiali trinitate (MSG 75)

80C 39

297B 39

300A 39

321D–324A 39

324A 40

596BC 40

De st. trinitate dialogi (SC 231)

270f. 40f. n.122

CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS

Catecheses (ed. W.C. Reischl/J. Rupp, Munich 1848/60)

IV,7 (I, 96) 19 n.46

XI,10 26

DAVID

In Isagogen commentaria (CAG XVIII/2)

113,11–118,4 89–93

168,1–169,17 99

DEXIPPUS

In Categorias commentarius (CAG IV/2)

I,21 (22–25) 79f.

I,22 (23f.) 74f. n.222

II,20–22 84f.

DIADOCHUS PHOTICENSIS

Cephalaia gnostica (SC 5)

31 (101) 187 n.682

DIDYMUS ALEXANDRINUS

Commentarii in Zacchariam (SC 84)

II, 139,1f. (139) 19 n.47

Fragmenta in Psalmos (PTS 15)

26 (132,1f.) 21 n.59

De trinitate I–II,7 (ed. J. Hönscheid/I. Seiler, Meisenheim 1975)

I, 16,44 (98) 34

I, 25,15f. (160) 34 n.96

II, 1,7–9 (8–10) 34 n.97

De trinitate II,8–III (MSG 39)

616A 34 n.97

972B 34 n.97

ELIAS

In Categorias commentaria (CAG XVIII/1)

154,13–155,8 95

EPHRAEM ANTIOCHENUS

Apologia ad Domnum et Johannem
(apud Photium cod. 229)

256b24–33 103, 106

Capita ad Acacium (ed. S. Helmer,
Bonn 1962)

272,6–11 101–103

EPIPHANIUS

Ancoratus (GCS 25)

19,1 (27) 19 n.49

77,5 (96 f.) 22

Panarion (GCS 25, 31, 37)

25,4 (271) 35 n.98

57,4 f. (348 f.) 35 f. n.101

65,1 (3) 35

65,3 (5 f.) 36

71,5 (254) 36

72,11 (265 f.) 32

73,30 f. (305) 30 f.

EUSEBIUS CAESAREENSIS

Commentarius in Psalmos (MSG 23)

509A 28

GENNADIUS CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS

(?)

Contra Nestorianos (ed. J. Declerck,
Byzantion 60 [1990])

138 51 n.139

GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSIS

Epistulae (SC 208)

101,20 f. (44 f.) 66 f.

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS

De beatitudinibus (GNO VII/2)

VIII,4 (120,5–10) 21

In Ecclesiasten (GNO V)

V (354,21 f.) 20 f.

Contra Eunomium (GNO I–II)

III, 6,17 (191 f.) 33 n.92, 187

Adversus Macedonianos (GNO III/1)

102,27 f. 33 n.92

Oratio catechetica (GNO III/4)

8 (35,8–16) 33 n.92

HIERONYMUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS

De effectu baptismi (SC 455)

348 187 n.684

HYMENAEUS EPISCOPUS (E.A.)

Epistula contra Paulum Samosatenum
(ed. E. Schwartz, Munich 1927)

42–44 25 f.

46 26

IRENAEUS

Fragmenta (ed. W.W. Harvey,
Cambridge 1857)

19 13 f., 19 n.48

JOHANNES CAESAREENSIS GRAMMATICUS

Apologia concilii Chalcedonensis
(CCG 1)

IV,1–6 (51–56) 53–55

fr. 13 (8) 52

JOHANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS

Homiliae in Johannem (MSG 59)

47B 37 n.106

57D 18 n.44

Homiliae in principium Actorum (MSG 51)

107B 20 n.50

Homiliae in I ad Corinthios (MSG 61)

79B 20 n.51

Homiliae in ep. ad Philippenses (MSG 62)

219B 37 n.106

Homiliae in ep. ad Hebraeos
(MSG 63)

20B 37 f.

22B 37

JOHANNES DAMASCENUS

Contra Acephalos (PTS 22)

6,1–15 (414) 170 f.

JOHANNES DAMASCENUS (*cont.*)*Dialectica* (PTS 7)

30	165
45	165–168, 173
67	177
[69]	166–168

De duabus in Christo voluntatibus (PTS 22)

2,15–33 (174 f.)	181
7,12–27 (183 f.)	177 f.
9,28–48 (192)	178 f.
37 (222)	180

Expositio fidei (PTS 12)

6,4–11 (15)	163
8,38–187 (23–25)	163 f.
8,184 (26)	41 n.123
53,14–17 (128)	169

Contra Jacobitas (PTS 22)

11	103, 172–
	174
12,4–13	164, 169
79,10–12 (179)	169
80,12–17 (137 f.)	180 f.

Contra Nestorianos (PTS 22)

2,14–18 (265)	169
43,32–46 (286 f.)	178

JOHANNES PHILOPONUS

In Categorias commentaria (CAG XIII/1)

58,15–17	68
134,13–136,31	86–88
147,9–149,18	87 f.

In Physicam commentaria (CAG XVif.)

4,20; 205,19	12 n.23
779,28–30	69

JOHANNES SCYTHOPOLITANUS

Scholia in Dionysii De divinis nominibus (PTS 62)

204,37–39 (209 f.)	51 n.141
304,40 f. (307)	51 n.141

JUSTINIANUS IMPERATOR

Edictum rectae fidei (ed. M. Amelotti e.a.; Milan ²1973)

144,29–146,12	1
---------------	---

LEONTIUS BYZANTINUS

Deprehensio et Triumphus Nestorianorum (MSG 86/I)

1380C	68
-------	----

Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos (MSG 86/I)

1277D–1280B	61–67, 106–109, 128, 131, 143–145, 165, 172–174
1300A	62
1304BC	173

Solutio adversus argumenta Severi (MSG 86/II)

1917C	68
1920D–1921B	62 n.179
1940B	146
1944C	61, 68
1945BC	106, 121

LEONTIUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS

Contra Monophysitas (ed. P. Gray, Oxford 2006)

210	131
-----	-----

Contra Nestorianos (MSG 86/I)

II,1 (1528D)	123 f.
II,5	125 f.
II,6 f.	133–135
II,11 f.	133, 140
II,13	123, 127–132
II,21	136 f.
IV,36 (1704D)	124
V,28 (1748CD)	124 f., 132 f.
VII,1 (1760B)	124

MACARIUS/SYMEON

Homiliae spirituales 50 (PTS 4)

4,169	22 n.59
16,11–14,77 f.	21 n.59, 187 n.684
16,22–26	22

Sermones 64 (TU 72)

18 (96,16–24)	20
---------------	----

MARCELLUS ANCYRANUS

Expositio fidei (ed. H. Nordberg,
Helsinki 1962)

1,2 (49) 31

Fragmenta (apud Eusebium) (ed. M.
Vinzent, Leiden 1997)

70 (61) 28

76 (68) 28

MARCUS MONACHUS

De his qui putant... (SC 445)

211,8 (198) 21

De lege spirituali (SC 445)

65 (90) 21

De paenitentia (SC 445)

2,7 (218) 21

MATTHIAS MARTINI

Christiana et catholica fides (Bremen
1618)

II, 5 (271) 4

MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

Ambigua ad Thomam (CCG 48)

1,23–31 141 f., 146 f.

Disputatio cum Pyrrho (MSG 91)

289B 151

Epistulae (MSG 91)

13 (532BC) 146

15 (552C–555A) 140, 150 f.

15 (557D–560A) 144 f., 157

15 (560BC) 154 f.

Mystagogia (CCG 69)

20 (47) 101 f. n.343, 142,

149

24 (59) 142

Opuscula theologica et polemica
(MSG 91)

4 (61B) 150

14 (149BC.152D) 144 f.

16 (204A–205B) 147–149

23 143 f.

NESTORIUS

Liber Heraclidis (tr. F. Nau, Paris
1910)

284 53 n.149

OLYMPIODORUS

In Alcibiadem commentaria (ed. L.G.
Westerink, Amsterdam 1956)

204 99 f.

In Categorias commentaria (CAG
XII/1)

30,33–31,1 94

ORIGENES

Fragmenta in Deuteronomium

(MSG 17)

28B 15; 19 n.50

Fragmenta in Proverbia (MSG 17)

185AB 15–17

Commentarii in Matthaeum

(GCS 41)

235 14 f n.32

Commentarii in Johannem (SC 157)

VI, 44 f. 14

De principiis (GCS 22)

I 2,2 (28,13–29,3)

17

I 7,1 (86,20 f.) 16

IV 4,3 (352,17 f.) 17

PAMPHILUS

Panhoplion dogmaticum (CCG 19)

II, 132–156 (140 f.)

103, 106 f.

III, 31–33 (145) 112 f.

VII (173–176) 107–113

XI, 151–158 (207)

107

PLATO

Parmenides

130e–133a 91, 94 f.

Sophistes

251–258 91

Symposium

211ab 69 f.

PLOTINUS

Enneades

II 6 84

VI 3,8 74 f.

VI 4,2.7 94 f.

PORPHYRIUS

In Categorías per interrogationem...

(CAG IV/1)

77 f. 73 f.

79 79

95 84

99 84

Isagoge (CAG IV/1)

2 (7) 98–100

5 (12 f.) 81

Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes (ed. E. Lambertz, Leipzig

1975)

19 (10) 96

PROCLUS

Elementatio theologica (ed. E.R. Dodds, Oxford 1963)

prop. 23 f. (26 f.)

95

In Parmenidem commentarius (ed.

C. Macé e.a., Oxford 2007–2009)

II, 61 f. 90 n.291

III, 28 96 f.

PSEUDO-ATHANASIOS

Dialogi contra Macedonianos (ed.

E. Cavalcanti, Turin 1983)

20,54–65 (106) 34 f. n.97

Epistula ad Jovianum (ed. C. Bizer, Bonn 1970)

300,14–301,17 57–59, 103, 111–113,

150 f., 169

De incarnatione contra Apolinarium

(MSG 26)

1129B 19 n.47

Symbolum quicumque (MSG 28)

1589D–1592A 6 n.19

De trinitate dialogi I et III (MSG 28)

1124C 187 n.682

1125AB 33

1141D 57

1161A 33 n.94

1240AB 34 n.97

De trinitate dialogus II (ed. C. Bizer, Bonn 1970)

91 20 n.50

De trinitate dialogi IV et V (CSCO subs. 125)

IV,2 (70) 59

IV,4 (76) 58 f.

IV,5 (78) 60

IV,6 (80 f.) 60, 112

V,25 (158) 18 n.44

De trinitate (MSG 28, 1604 f.)

1604BC 35 n.97

PSEUDO-BASILIOS

Contra Eunomium IV–V (MSG 29)

713C 101 n.343

749B 56 f.

PSEUDO-CAESARIUS ARELATENSIS

Quaestiones et responsiones (GCS 1989)

3, 38.54 e.a. 51 n.141

PSEUDO-GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS

Fragmentum ex oratione ctr. astronomos (MSG 36)

675B 187 f. n.684

Testimonia adversus Iudaeos

(MSG 46)

196C 51 n.141

PSEUDO-JUSTINUS (THEODORETUS)

Expositio fidei (ed. J.C.T. Otto, Jena 1880)

10 (24 f.) 151 f. n.550

10–15 (34–54) 111–113

11 (36 f.) 144 n.507

ROMANUS MELODUS

Hymni (SC 128)

45,12 (590) 18 n.44

RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS

Expositio symboli (CCL 20)

7 (143 f.) 14 n.32, 16 n.36, 37 n.107

SECUNDUS TACITURNUS

Sententiae (ed. B.E. Perry, Ithaca 1964)

11 (84) 12 f.

SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS

Contra impium grammaticum (CSCO
111 f.)

II,1–5 159 f.

II,17 (151/118) 52 f.

II,31 (238) 61 n.173

Epistulae ad Sergium (CSCO 120 f.)

2 (83) 61 n.173

SEXTUS EMPIRICUS

Adversus Mathematicos (ed. R.G. Bury,
Cambridge 1960)

X, 238 f. (326) 56

SIMPLICIUS

In Categorias commentaria (CAG VIII)

48,1–33 74

69,3–71,2 95 f.

93,32–94,23 89

95,34–96,16 75 f.

270,32–271,5 88

SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS

Historia ecclesiastica (GCS NS 1)

I, 23,8 (70) 32

II, 19,17 (115) 30

THEODORUS ABBAS

De sectis (MSG 86/I)

VII (1240A–1241C)

114–118, 156 f.,

165 f., 188

VII (1249A–D) 143 n.507, 157

n.571

THEODORUS RAI THUENSIS

Praeparatio (ed. F. Diekamp, Rome
1938)

192,9–22 110 n.370

THEODOSIUS ALEXANDRINUS

Oratio theologica (ed. A. v. Roey/
P. Allen, Leuven 1994)

162/234 52 n.146

THEOPHILUS ALEXANDRINUS

Homilia de mystica coena

(MSG 77)

1017C.20A 18 n.43

GENERAL INDEX

- Accident and Substance 37 f., 40,
 56 f., 64–66, 70–89, 101 f., 106–108,
 116–118, 134 f., 144, 148, 150 f., 157, 165,
 170 f., 174 f., 177 f.
 Adoptionism 35, 38, 49
 Ambrose of Milan 16
 Ammonius son of Hermias 56, 66,
 76–99, 108, 116
 Anastasius of Antioch 97, 118–122,
 131–137, 140, 151, 153 f., 173, 185
 Anastasius Sinaites 58, 66, 102, 142,
 149, 155–162, 173, 183
 ἀνυπόστατος 3, 5, 12 f., 17 f., 25 f., 30,
 33, 38, 45, 56 f., 63, 65 f., 103, 115–117,
 120, 125, 128, 131 f., 142, 148, 157 f., 161,
 165, 183, 188
 Apollinaris/Apollinarians 19, 21 f.,
 49 f., 58–60, 132, 152
 Aristotle 11, 37 f., 56, 65, 68–99, 106,
 139, 151 f., 158, 185
 Athanasius 29, 31 f., 54, 60, 151

 Babai the Great 53
 Barth, Karl 2 f., 45
 Basil of Caesarea 21, 31, 33, 57, 66,
 68
 Blood (menstrual, of the Virgin) 152,
 178 f.
 Boethius 74, 79, 94

 Cappadocian terminology cf.
 Neonicene terminology
 Cosubsistence (of Christ's natures)
 63, 68, 133, 145 f., 175 f.
 Cyril of Alexandria 7, 12, 18 f., 25, 33,
 38–41, 49 f., 52 f., 55, 59 f., 101, 103,
 115 f., 140, 158–160, 163 f., 175 f., 187
 Cyril of Jerusalem 14, 16, 19, 26

 David (Aristotelian commentator)
 64, 81 f., 90–93, 99 f., 130

 Dexippus 66, 73 f., 77, 79, 84–86, 131
 Didymus the blind 18 f., 21, 33 f., 57,
 101, 187
 δικαιοσύνη ἐνυπόστατος 18 f.
 Doctrina patrum de incarnatione
 verbi 50 f., 106, 140, 149, 155–159,
 163, 165 f., 184
 δύναμις ἐνυπόστατος 18 f., 26, 33, 39 f.,
 101, 141, 163 f.

 Elias (Aristotelian commentator)
 64, 68, 77–82, 85–87, 91 f., 95–97,
 99 f., 130, 156
 ἐν- (Prefix) 11 f., 102, 123, 174, 186
 ἐνούσιος 32, 38, 41, 57, 62, 65, 101–103,
 125–129, 131, 141, 146–148, 161 f., 164,
 169, 172 f., 187
 ἐνυπόστατος
 non-technical use 12 f., 16–22,
 51 f., 62, 123 f., 141 f., 160, 164,
 183 f.
 trinitarian use 15–17, 20, 25–41, 51,
 107, 141 f., 160, 163 f., 183 f.
 twofold use 53–56, 115–120, 145,
 149, 156 f., 161, 165 f., 170–172, 184,
 186
 'distinction'-tradition 22, 62–67,
 107 f., 120, 127–131, 142, 144–149,
 155–157, 160 f., 165–167, 170–174,
 185 f.
 'Enhypostasia' 1–5, 45 f., 55, 147, 164,
 168, 175
 Ephrem of Amid 61, 100–106, 114, 116,
 145, 149, 158, 161 f., 186
 Epiphanius of Salamis 14 f., 19–22,
 30–32, 35 f., 51
 ἐπουσιώδης 64–66, 82, 106
 Essence and Existence 57, 62–67,
 91–96, 141 f., 147, 173 f., 185 f., 188
 Eulogius of Alexandria 51 f., 99, 104,
 121, 143, 156, 158

- Eusebius of Cesarea 12, 15, 17, 27–33, 35 f., 56, 163
 Eustathius the monk 61, 113
 Eutychius of Constantinople 64, 144
- Gennadius of Constantinople 51, 58
 Gregory of Nazianzus 40, 52, 66 f., 141, 146 f., 153
 Gregory of Nyssa 20 f., 33, 57, 60, 66, 99, 146, 187
- Henanisho 53, 125
 Ἡνανῖς ἐνυπόστατος 52 f., 55, 62, 162
 Hermias 12, 66, 131
 Hilary of Poitiers 16, 27
 Hypostasis
 conception of 57–60, 130 f., 153–155, 176–179
 ‘bundle of properties’ 37, 54, 62, 90, 98 f., 102 f., 119–122, 135–137, 144 f., 153 f., 161 f., 171–174, 178, 180 f., 185
- Idea (Platonic) 69, 89–96, 134
 Iechl 6, 11, 79
 Individuality/Individuation 2, 4, 45 f., 54–57, 60, 62–66, 68 f., 83, 89–92, 96–100, 108, 115 f., 121 f., 125 f., 131, 136 f., 144 f., 154, 165 f., 171–173, 177–181, 185
 Individual natures 119–122, 131–137, 145, 180
 Insusistence formula 7, 46 f., 57–61, 68 f., 103, 110–113, 132–137, 150–155, 168 f., 174–181
 Insusistence Christology (systematical problems) 57–61, 121 f., 131, 133–137, 153 f., 179–181, 184 f.
- John Chrysostom 18, 20, 33, 37 f., 152, 163
 John of Damascus 1, 3, 6 f., 42, 60, 62, 67, 100, 103, 106, 113, 152, 154–156, 162–181, 183, 186
 John the Grammarian 49–61, 63, 100, 107, 113–116, 118–120, 122–124, 131, 136 f., 140, 143, 156–158, 165, 170, 184 f.
- John Maxentius 53
 John Philoponus 12, 56, 63 f., 66, 68 f., 77 f., 80–87, 89–94, 96–99, 106, 119, 153, 156, 184 f.
 John of Scythopolis 51
 Jamblichus 75, 78–81, 85, 97
 Justinian 1, 5, 53 f., 105, 113, 118, 143
- Leontius of Byzantium 5–7, 41, 45 f., 55, 61–69, 97, 100–103, 106–110, 113 f., 118, 121, 123, 126–128, 131, 133, 137, 139 f., 143–146, 148, 154–158, 165–168, 172–174, 185 f., 188
 Leontius of Jerusalem 99 f., 104–106, 113, 121–137, 140, 143, 155, 158, 183, 185
 Logos
 - ἐνδιαθετός/προφορικός 14, 18, 26–36, 38 f., 101, 163
 - replacing male seed 110–113, 151–154, 178–180
- Marcellus of Ancyra 25, 27–33, 35
 Mark the Monk 21
 Matter and Form 11 f., 71 f., 74 f., 77–82, 88, 90, 95–100, 152, 186
 Maximus the Confessor 7, 12, 101 f., 113, 122, 137, 139–158, 160–162, 164–168, 171, 175–181, 185 f., 188
 Melito of Sardes 11 f.
 Modalism 14, 17, 25–27, 30 f., 33–35, 37 f., 41, 50
 Monophysitism 3, 41, 49, 52 f., 58–61, 65, 104, 110, 114–120, 122, 143, 145 f., 148, 158–160, 184
- Nemesius of Emesa 153, 162, 186
 Neonicene terminology 30 f., 35, 50 f., 53 f., 56 f., 60, 64 f., 100, 105 f., 110, 119, 121, 123, 128, 131, 140, 154, 171, 177 f., 184
 Nestorius/Nestorians 3, 41, 51, 53, 55, 98, 105, 114, 124–129, 131, 133–136, 159, 184
 Neochalcedonism (vs. strict Chalcedonism) 5, 45–49, 51, 58, 60 f., 68, 103, 110–114, 117 f., 121 f., 133, 140, 154, 159, 167, 170, 180, 183 f., 186

- 'no nature without hypostasis' 3, 49,
53, 63, 102 f., 107, 109, 114, 119 f., 124,
131, 134, 148, 155, 157–160, 165, 184 f.
- Olympiodorus (Aristotelian commen-
tator) 12, 77 f., 80–82, 85, 87, 92,
94, 96 f., 99 f.
- Origen/Origenism 7, 14–22, 26 f.,
29 f., 32 f., 163
- Pamphilus the theologian 7, 53, 58,
68, 100, 103–113, 131, 156–158, 172 f.
- Participation 59 f., 88, 90–97, 121, 174,
177, 180
- Paul of Samosata 14, 16, 25, 30, 35, 38,
49, 114
- Philoxenus of Mabbug 61, 160
- Photinus of Sirmium 29 f., 35 f., 38
- Plato/Platonism 12, 17, 68–71, 74, 76,
81, 90–93, 98 f., 134, 139, 146
- Plotinus 74–76, 78–80, 82–85, 94 f.,
101
- Porphyry 12, 66, 72–82, 84–86, 89,
96, 98–100, 106, 178
- Proclus Diadochus Platonius 12, 77,
90–93, 95 f., 98–101, 106, 108
- Pseudo-Athanasius 6, 16, 18–20, 31,
33 f., 37, 47, 57–60, 103, 111–113, 151,
153, 155, 177, 184, 187
- Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita 12, 51,
95, 152
- Pseudo-Justin cf. Theodoretus
- Qualities (substantial) 40, 62–67,
80–89, 99, 106, 109, 131, 148, 174, 185
- Quenstedt, J.A. 4, 45
- Rufinus of Aquileia 14, 16 f., 37
- Severus of Antioch 51–53, 55, 61, 104,
122 f., 140, 148, 158 f.
- Simplicius 12, 57, 63, 66, 68, 74–80,
82–89, 91, 95, 97 f., 100, 131
- Sophronius of Jerusalem 104, 140
- σοφία ἐνυπόστατος 15–20, 25, 30 f.,
39 f., 50, 56, 141, 163 f.
- Spirit, Holy (hypostatical indepen-
dence of) 27, 29, 32–35, 40 f., 52,
121, 141 f., 163 f.
- Subordinatianism 15, 25, 31
- Theodore of Mopsuestia 49, 118
- Theodore of Raithu 110, 150, 175
- Theodoretus 50 f., 59, 110–113, 118,
144, 151, 178
- Threefold Universal 89–95, 106, 134
- Tritheism 97, 99, 107, 109 f., 118 f., 124,
134, 184 f.
- τρόπος ὑπάρξεως 60, 122, 153 f., 176–
180, 185
- Universals 54, 68–70, 89–100, 108,
134, 150, 153, 156, 185
- Zachary the Rhetorician 113